



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

ARTICLE IX.

PROBLEMATIC PASSAGES IN THE RIG-VEDA.

BY PROFESSOR EDWARD WASHBURN HOPKINS,

OF BRYN MAWR COLLEGE, BRYN MAWR, PA.

Presented to the Society April 22d, 1892.

I. RV. viii. 1. 1-2, *īndram 't stotā vr'saṇam . . avakraksīnam vr'sabhām yathā 'jūram gām ná carṣaṇīsāham*. Pischel, *Vedische Studien*, i. 103, translates "den nicht alternden, der wie eine Kuh (erfreulich ist), den die Menschen bezwingenden," and separates *ajūram* from the noun, because *yathā* shows by its lack of accent that the comparison ends there. Apart from this reason, Pischel then adduces another, viz. that *gām ná* may not be construed with *carṣaṇīsāham* because "a 'cow that subdues the folk' is just as silly as 'a bull that does not grow old.'" The silliness of speaking of a god represented as a bull that does not grow old is not altogether apparent; but my objection to this objection rests on usage rather than on abstract appropriateness of expression. In iii. 7. 7 'bulls that do not grow old' are referred to (*uksāno ajuryāh*), whether applied to gods or to priests (Sāyana). The silliness of the second expression depends on whether *gām* must be taken as 'cow.' The proximity of *vr'sabhām* would seem to make it quite possible to take *gāūh* as *vr'sabhó gāūh*, as Agni in x. 5. 7 is called a *vr'sabhó dhenūh*: with which compare iii. 38. 7, *vr'sabhásya dhenóh . . . góh*. An ellipse such as Pischel assumes for our passage seems to me with these parallels in mind rather improbable. The final words, admitting that *yathā* closes the comparison, may be rendered 'crashing down like a steer, the ageless one who like a bull subdues the earth.*'

* It is perhaps not impossible that *gām* may be the object associated after that understood in *carṣaṇī-sāham*, 'who subdues the earth as if it were a cow,' preserving the image of the bull by implication. In v. 37. 3 Indra has to do with a 'woman seeking a husband,' who unites the conception of cow and earth. As Indra is *mahiśá*, she is *māhisi*; she is also *īśirā*, 'strong,' an epithet given to earth in iii. 30. 9. Yet, apart from the syntactical question raised by this construction, this cow-earth image is, so far as I have observed, as rare in the Veda as it is common in the Epic. In iv. 41. 5; x. 133. 7, *māhī gāūh* must, I think, be the priest's productive song.

II. viii. 2. 12, *hrtsû pûtâso yudhyante durmâdâso nâ sūrâyām : ū'dhar nâ nagnâ jarante*. Grassmann : "die hineingetränkten kämpfen . . nahn der Brust wie nackte Kinder." Ludwig : "im geiste kämpfen die getrunkenen . . wie das euter rauschen sie nackt." Translate : 'Swelling in their hearts (the personified somas) fight like drunkards over liquor ; being (as yet) unclothed (i. e. not mixed with milk), they make a noise (in streaming down from the vats to the vessel) resembling (the noise made by streams of milk coming from an) udder.' This rather cumbersome translation gives, I think, the true sense, and is justified by the following considerations : * *nagnâh*, compare viii. 1. 17, 'then press the soma with the stones, wash it in water ; clothing it as it were in garments of milk, so the men shall milk it out of the *vaksânâ*.' 'Naked' applied to soma means, then, unclothed with milk.—*ū'dhar* : compare viii. 9. 19, *yád âpîtâso añcâvo gâvo nâ duhrâ ū'dhabhih : yád vâ vâñir ânûsata*, 'when the swelling stalks like cows with udders are milked, and when the choric music sounds.' This verse also explains *pûtâsâh* in our passage. It is the music of pressed soma dropping from the vat where are the swollen stalks to which reference is made. Even if verse 12 were not interpolated (which, as Ludwig shows, is probable), the order to mix with milk has only just been given (vs. 11). 'Like an udder' is for the prose 'as when cows are milked.' Compare also viii. 12. 32, *yád . . âsvaran dohânâ(h)*. I fancy—a supposition not material to the meaning of our verse—that vs. 12 belongs after vs. 8 : 'three vats drip (with soma), three well-filled holders ;' then 12 = 'the streams of soma are dripping noisily so that it sounds like milking a cow ;' then 9 : 'O soma, thou art clear ; (when) mixed with milk (thou art) pleasant to Indra ;' then 10 : 'O Indra, thy pressed soma-drops are clear ; they are asking for the mixing of the milk ;' then 11 : 'mix the mixing of milk.' But in either position the soma-drops are not yet mixed, still less drunk. It is then impossible to suppose that they are fighting with their clothes off in Indra's belly, apart from the fact that *hrtsû* cannot bear this interpretation. In no further instance in the Rîg-Veda cited by PW. and Grassmann for such meaning can *hr'd* (or *hr'daya*) mean 'breast and stomach especially ;' but it always means 'heart' or 'spirit.' Where PW. sees 'body' in viii. 17. 6, *hr'd* stands in direct antithesis to body (*svādûś te astu samsûde mādhumân tanvè tâva : sômaḥ gâm astu te hr'dé*) : 'sweet to thy body and weal to thy heart be the soma.' How can one see 'stomach' here ? Compare the same expression x.

* I waive a refutation of Grassmann's guess. As for Ludwig's translation, he first explains it thus : The soma having been drunk is freed from the milk and becomes a divine drink ; as drunken people tear off each other's clothes, so do the soma-drops when Indra has drunk them—and then adds that the passage is as good as unintelligible. In his second attempt at an explanation (which is still worse as regards the first part of the passage) Ludwig has, however, found (but failed to use) the key.

86. 15 ; 186. 1, *vāta ā vātu bhesajām gambhū mayobhū no hrdē*. The 'medicine which brings weal and joy' when blown by the wind is not one that affects the stomach. Of the same sort is i. 91. 13, *sōma rārandhī no hrdī* 'rejoice thyself in our heart,' followed by 'in thy friendship,' which indicates well enough that *hr'd* is heart, not stomach. So iii. 42. 8 ; iv. 53. 6, *antār hrdā mānasā pūyāmānāh*. In ix. 73. 8 and in x. 32. 9 *hrdī* has nothing to do with body, and in x. 25. 2 *hrdispr'c* means 'tickling the heart,' pleasing the spirit. Other cases are comprised in the formula *hrtsū pītāh*. This formula in i. 179. 5 is out of connection with what precedes, but probably gives the same thought as in viii. 48. 12 : 'the soma-drop that, swelling in heart (i. e. fermented), immortal, has entered mortals.' The plural is formal, and gives the same abstract notion with that conveyed by the Greek plural (*φρῆνες* etc.). In i. 179. 5 ('this soma inside (me) swelling in heart I address') it is of course possible to interpret *pītā* as 'drunk,' but see the following. The finest example to compare with our passage is i. 168. 3, where the storm-winds are described as 'like soma-drops, which with swelling stems when pressed, in heart expanding, restless, sit not still' (*sōmāso nā yē sutās trptāncavo hrtsū pītāso dūvdāso nā* 'sate'), the same comparison. The drops are personified. It is evident, if we add to this the words of viii. 9. 19, *āpītāso ançāvaḥ*, of the stems swelling, that the soma is in the vat. According to the usage described in the Rig-Veda, the soma is allowed to stand for a day or two before drinking (*tirōahnyah*, iii. 58. 7). When it ferments it works, "geht auf," swells, or, as the poet cited above says, 'is restless, sits not still, expands in heart.'

The place where the soma goes when drunk by Indra is given in the exhortation at the beginning of our hymn : 'drink thy belly full' (*pībā sūpārnam udāram* : compare ii. 11. 11, *kukṣī* ; so *jathāra*, i. 104. 9 etc.).

For another image of a similar noise, *ghrtaçcūt svārāh*, compare ii. 11. 7 ; and, for the udder as soma-holder, iii. 48. 3. In ii. 14. 10 we have a parallel simile, since the udder is here Indra's belly, which might tempt us to render the close of our verse "as to an udder they come ;" but the parallels above cited and *nagnāh* forbid this interpretation.*

As for *pītā*, the verb in the active middle participle is peculiarly soma's. The fact that it once occurs in the form *ā + pīta* cannot give a necessary norm. Conversely, *hrtsū pītāh* in i. 168. 3 and viii. 2. 12 means the soma in heart in the vat (or nothing), and must be identical with *āpītāso ançāvaḥ* in viii. 9. 19. The only doubt that can hang about *pītā* is whether in i. 179. 5 we are authorized to give it the possible meaning of 'drunk,' requiring 'stomach' for *hrtsū* in addition to its necessary meaning of

* Compare v. 44, 13 ; and, for another instance of the 'naked' metaphor, here streams, see *āvasānā ānagnāh*, iii. 1. 6. Compare viii. 1. 17 (above), *gavyā vāstreva*.

'swollen' above. I doubt this. The phrase is used conventionally. The passages that explain definitely what is meant show the signification to be 'swollen.'

III. viii. 2. 14 and 19-20 : 14, *ukthâm canâ çasyâmānam āgor arîr āciketa: nâ gāyatrām gīyāmānam*. Grassmann omits *arî*; Ludwig alters the text. As *arî* is applied to the Maruts, v. 54.12, may it not here be said of Indra? 'Neither the hymn that praises nor the song that is sung of him that is impecunious does he, the active one, notice.' It has just been said that the worshiper like the god shall be wealthy. Perhaps 'friend,' as in x. 28. 1?

19-20 (the idea of wealth is still prominent), 'Come hither to us with wealth; do not despise us; (come) like a rich bridegroom; may (the god) not make stop (?) away from us to-day, disagreeable as a poor son-in-law.* The *hî* of the next verse shows that it is the wealth which the poet is after, 'for we know his generous kindness.' The *mahân yûvajāniḥ* is the bridegroom, antithetical to the 'poor son-in-law' following. Compare of Indra-Agni the expression in i. 109. 2 (*āgravaṁ hî bhūrīdāvatārā vām vījāmātur utā vā ghā syātāt*), 'I hear you are more generous than a son-in-law or a brother-in-law (wife's brother).' The *iva* is not included in the negative, and *mā hr̥nīthāh* is to be taken parenthetically; in the second clause the negative (prohibition) is separated from the verb, and *iva* refers more especially to the adjective. *Çrî* is 'wealth.' Compare viii. 8. 17 (*kṛtām naḥ suçrīyāh*), 'make us very rich' (not 'beautiful'). The rich (*māhān*) son-in-law (bridegroom) gives his bride's family something; the poor one is disagreeable, ungracious.† The opposite point of view is given in x. 28. 1 : 'all other friends are arrived; only my father-in-law (Indra) is not come. May he eat corn and drink soma, and go back home satiated.' For here the poet is the giver, and the god the receiver. In x. 95. 4 food is apparently carried to the father-in-law; but the passage is doubtful.‡

I add doubtfully a suggestion. Comparing the frequent appeals to Indra not to 'stay away' (compare viii. 2. 26, *ārē asmāt*; vii. 32. 1, *mō śu tvā vāghātaç canā 'rē asmān ní rīraman*; vii. 22. 6, *mā 'rē asmān . . jyók kaḥ*), it seems as if *adyā sāyām*, in spite of the cæsura, might mean 'to-day till evening.' The ordinary meaning of *sāyām* would be kept, as antithetical to *prātār* (*nā sāyām*, v. 77. 2). The phrase *adyā sāyām* bears then the same relation to the verb that *jyók* does above. Compare i. 33. 15, *jyók tasthivānso akran* 'they made it long, standing.' Compare

* *mā hr̥nīthā abhy āsmān, mahān iva yûvajāniḥ . . . açrīrā iva jāmātā*.

† Of course in vi. 28. 6 the adjective must be taken as 'ugly.' Compare this Journal xiii. 345, on i. 109. 2.

‡ The cases are sociologically interesting. I have already pointed out in this Journal (Ruling Caste) that the received English notions in regard to patriarchal life in early India require revision. The present passages show that the sons-in-law had separate 'establishments.' [See now on this passage Pischel and Geldner's *Vedische Studien* ii. 78, with note at the end of this paper.]

sāyāhna = 'eve of the day' in Mbhā. We should thus translate literally, *mó sv ādyā durhānāvānt sāyām karad āre asmāt*, not with P.W., 'make stop' (which assumes a unique meaning for *sāyām*, and interprets the passage as if it meant 'do not go off somewhere else'), but, understanding that the sacrifice takes place in the morning, 'may he not ungraciously to-day make it evening (that he stays) away from us, as if he were a poor (ungenerous) son-in-law : ' i. e. continue all day ungenerous.

IV. viii. 3. 16, *kānvā iva bhr'gavaḥ sūryā iva vīcvaṃ id dhītām ānaḥ*: *īndrām stōmebhir mahāyanta āyāvaḥ priyāmedhāso asvaran*. Grassmann: "den Bhrigus gleich erreichten jeden Herzenswunsch die Kanvas." Ludwig: "wie die Kanvas sind die Bhrigus, wie sonnen; all ihr gewünschtes haben sie erreicht." Both wrong, and Grassmann absurd. The meaning is 'the Kanvas, (clever) as the Bhrigus, (brilliant) as suns, have completed their hymn; magnifying Indra with praises, the active Priyamedhas have sung.' Original *finis*. For the position of *iva* compare i. 127. 2 (*iva dyām*, cited *Ved. St.* p. 105); *iva sūryam*, *nā sūryam*, i. 130. 2; *nā mitrām*, ii. 4. 3; add *iva* in vii. 55. 2. But if no parallel existed sense must still prevail over usage. For the comparison see iv. 16. 20, and x. 39. 14 (*brāhmā 'karma and stōmam . . ātakṣāma bhr'gavo nā rātham*), 'we have made a hymn as the Bhrigus did the chariot,' often referred to as artists (artisans). And, again, viii. 102. 4 (*āurvabhrguvāt . . ā huve*), 'I call (the god) like Āurva, like Bhrigu.' So *bhr'guvāt*, viii. 43. 13. For the comparison of the mental brilliancy of the poet to the physical brilliancy of the sun, see below, on viii. 6. 7-8. The word *dhītā* means not 'wish' but 'what the poet has thought out,' and so his hymn. The same use of the verb occurs in connection with other words for hymns. In viii. 4. 6, *yās ta ānaḥ ūpastutim* means 'who has got to praise thee,' i. e. has sung a hymn to thee. Compare the exactly parallel expression in vii. 90. 2, *prāhutim yās ta ānat*, which can mean only 'offers thee libation.' In vi. 15. 11, *tām pāsi . . yās ta ānaḥ . . dhītīm* means 'thou guardest him that has got to commemorate thee' (made thee a hymn). The (concluding) verse v. 81. 5 has *te stōmam ānaḥ* 'got to praise thee.' Ludwig gives to *ūpastuti* a forced signification which is unnecessary. It means only 'laud,' as in vii. 83. 7, *satyā . . ūpastutir, devā eṣām abhavan*, their praise was so effective that they won over the gods to their side (for the phrase cf. viii. 16. 5). In viii. 8. 10, *vīcvaṇi . . prā dhītāny agachātam* 'ye twain arrived at all your intent,' the phrase differs only in so far as that *dhītā* means here what was thought about, and so approaches the idea of wish. But *sām dhītām aṣnutam* in viii. 40. 3 means 'get the hymn,' applied to the gods (compare *gīh* in the following verse). Such is Sāyana's explanation of ii. 31. 7, which, in diverse metre, concludes a racing song (perhaps placed here on account of *sāptir nā rāthyah*), a passage which contains at once the phrase *ātakṣann āyāvaḥ* and *dhītīm aṣyāḥ*. The modern translators vainly struggle to make the subject of both verbs identical. Sāyana trans-

lates : 'these words (*ûdyatû*) they actively fashioned, desiring fame and wishing wealth ; may (the host of gods) like a race-horse (i. e. speedily) get the hymn.' The last part is right, the first forced, but the best that can be done with the present text. As in iv. 5. 7, we might read *dhîtir*, rendering 'may the hymn reach you ;' but it is more likely that, just as in ii. 19. 8 (penultimate verse) we find *mânma . . taksuh . . sumnâm acyuh*, so here we should read a plural for *acyâh*. Grassmann's "they hasten to the goal like a race-horse" is incorrect, nor is Ludwig's "as a race-horse might reach (the goal, may they meet your) intention" to be called very felicitous. Reading *âguh* would give the usual sense indicated above : 'they have actively fashioned and (swift) as a race-horse completed this hymn.' The general sense of viii. 3. 16 is, then, 'they have made a hymn, being as dextrous at their work as the Bhṛguś.' This is a common point of view of the poets themselves, as opposed to the 'seeing of song,' or inspiration, ascribed to them by their descendants.

V. viii. 4. 6, *sahâsreṇeva sacate yaviyûdhâ yâs ta ânal upastutim : putrâm prâvargâm kṛṇute svâtṛye dâçnôti nâmaûktibhih*. The relative in the second clause corresponding to that in the same position of the first is understood : 'as if with a thousand good battle-men he is accompanied—who makes thee laudation ; his son he makes distinguished in warrior's strength—who adores thee with praises.' *Sacate* as in vs. 9, *vâyasû sacate*. Grassmann and Ludwig translate the last part with evasive participles. I have no exact parallel for the omission of the relative, but it must be omitted.* Compare a somewhat similar case in the mistranslated verse vii. 84. 4 (*indrâvarunâ . . rayîm dhattam . . prâ yâ âdityô ânṛtâ minâty âmitâ çû'ro dayate vâsûni*), 'Indra and Varuṇa, bestow ye wealth . . who (as) the son of Aditi destroys(t) untruth, (who as) a warrior gives(t) unmeasured goods.† The 'warrior' can be only Indra, but the connection is so close that perhaps only one relative is felt here.

VI. viii. 4. 7-8, *mahât te vr'sno abhicâksyam kṛtâm pâçyema turvâçam yâdum* (etc.). Before reading further, it is necessary to examine these words more particularly. The construction reminds us of viii. 45. 27, *satyâm tât turvâçe yâdâu vîdâno ahnavâyyâm : vyçnat turvâne çâni* (where the pun *turvâça turvân* must be noticed) ; and of iv. 26. 1-2, *ahâm kavîh . . pâçyatû mâ : ahâm bhû'mim adadâm âryâya*, where 'I am the priest (the god) ; look at me ; I have given the earth to the Aryans' will show that the completion of the thought in one passage is to be expected in what immediately follows : 'great of thee, the bull, is the remarkable act accomplished—let us look upon Turvâça Yadu.' But Turvâça must first be investigated, before the following is introduced.

* Unless *dâçnôti nâmaûktibhih* could stand for *yâ 'çnôti namaḥ* (like *yâh . . ânal*)!

† Compare vii. 83. 6, 'Indra for wealth (*vâsvaḥ*) and Varuṇa for victory they call.' *Anṛtâ*, abstract.

According to received opinion, the first and last books of the Rig-Veda are in general later than the body of the work which they enclose. In this earlier portion, however, certain verses have been after appended to old hymns, which express some singer's gratitude for favors received of a king. These verses, technically called 'gift-lauds,' are usually of later origin than the hymn, and not of great historical importance for the earlier period when containing data opposed, though of interest when showing that any old use of phraseology or custom still obtains. Thus Zimmer (*Alt. Leb.* p. 129) says of the Cedi that they are mentioned 'only in a gift-laud' and in literature still more modern, and so does not claim any great antiquity for them.

Turvaça, whom some have striven to turn into a whole tribe, occurs in the earlier part of the Rig-Veda only as the name of a man. It is in the 'gift-lauds' and in the first and tenth books that he appears as a plural (the Turvaça family). It is an interesting study to see not only how modern scholars can manufacture history to order, but also how the Hindus, who are supposed to have no history, preserve sufficient historical data in their stratified literature to enable us to trace the change from fact to fiction. There is an important tribe called Yadavas, mentioned in the Rig-Veda as *yádvo jánah*, and found also in later times and literature. That there is no *jánah* of Turvaça in the earlier part of the Rig-Veda, and no tribe of that name known later,* is due to the fact that in the earlier time Turvaça is a contemporary hero (the king of the Yadavas); only in the 'gift-laud' period and that of the first book do we find the plural Turvaçāḥ, i. e. Turvaça's family, still called Yadavas. Thus, in the opening verse of our hymn (viii. 4. 1) it is said: 'O Indra, thou art most praised at the Anava's (king of Anavas) and at Turvaça's'—i. e. at the homes of these two friendly heroes; whereas the later 'gift-laud' appended to the end of the hymn speaks of gifts received not 'at Turvaça's' but 'at the Turvaçās' (*turvāçesu*), the plural occurring only here and in i. 108. 8: 'if ye are, O Indra-Agni, at the Yadavas', Turvaçās', if at the Druhyavas', Anavas', or Pūravas'—in each case the plural is not without significance. As we compare the different passages speaking of this 'Turvaça the Yadu,' it becomes more plain that we have to do with only one person. If the great deed referred to in our text (which is, as often stated, to save him from battle by getting him over the river) had been performed for the so-called 'Turvaça people' (in contradistinction to a Yadu-people), some token or mention of such a 'people' would have survived, as was the case with the 'Druhyu-people,' 'the Yadu-people,' etc. Nothing of the sort. 'Indra helped Turvaça (the) Yadu over the river' is all the text offers us (i. 174. 9; vi. 20. 12; v. 31. 8). The only passage that has a separation into two of Turvaça and Yadu is one that com-

* The later "Turvaça horses" may be named from the family as well as from a tribe. See *Ind. Studien*, i. 220.

memorates the same fact so often with the words 'helped over Turvaçā-Yadū,' which show that the poet understood Turvaça + Yadu : 'These two who could not swim Indra helped across' (iv. 30. 17, *utā tyā turvāçāyādū asnātārā . . 'ndrah . . apārayat*). If, however, we compare with this verse ii. 15. 5 (*só asnātī'n apārayat*), and consider not only that it mentions another wonder not known to the earlier version of the story as told in the account of the Ten-kings' battle (*utā tyā . . āryā . . ārnacitrārathā 'vadhīh*, ib.), but that the content of the whole hymn shows its late origin, we shall not lay much stress on this as authority for the period when 'Indra helped Turvaça the Yadu' (vi. 45. 1 ff.) ; for the dual belongs to the same epoch with that in which for the first time is found *yādus turvāç ca* (*māmahe*, x. 62. 10), a copulation unknown to the earlier period, as is also the shorter form of the name. Yet even in this later time, when outside of gift-laud the legend is recalled, the old form Turvaça Yadu (the Yadu) obtains (as in i. 36. 18 ; 54. 6 ; and x. 49. 8) ; and no *ca* is used. The formula Turvaça Yadu or Yadu Turvaça (v. 31. 8) is unvarying, except where once for emphasis a preposition separated from its verb is repeated, with the proper name and then with the tribal name, when on account of the separation the tribal name is turned into the adjective 'him of the Yadus', where 'king' is to be supplied. We find this in vii. 19. 8 : *nī turvāçam nī yādvam çīçīhi atithigvāya çānsyanī karīsyān* 'down (smite) Turvaça, down the Yadu-man' (*atithigvāya* etc. = vi. 26. 3). This occurs in the hymn following the account of the battle of the Ten Kings, in which appears only Turvaça as representative of the Yadavas. The former tale, Turvaça's relations with Atithigva (Divodāsa, ix. 61. 2), is barely alluded to in the Rîg-Veda. Our interest in Turvaça centres in the Ten-kings' battle, to which I now turn, adding only that, whereas Turvaça without Yadu may occur as proper name in the singular (i. 47. 7 ; vi. 27. 7, where Turvaça is distinguished from the plural peoples conquered, Vṛcivantas : see Zimmer, loc. cit., p. 124, who regards them as the Turvaça people), Yadu never occurs so, but only the Yadavas (plural) or 'Yadu-people' (viii. 6. 46, 48, gift-laud : cf. viii. 1. 31), *yādva* being apparently adjective to the same family with which Turvaça is identified, since the latter is especially dear to the poets of the eighth book (cf. viii. 4. 1, 19 ; 7. 18 ; 9. 14 ; 10. 5).

The distinction between singular and plural is important, because through ignoring it the facts in regard to one of the few historical occurrences mentioned in detail in the Rîg-Veda have been distorted by modern commentators. But another element of error has been at work in disguising the true account of the Battle of the Ten Kings. As well known, certain scholars of the day have established a theory that the 'five peoples' mentioned in the Rîg-Veda are enlisted as such in the great battle described in vii. 18. How far a too great zeal will carry the seeker after truth may be seen by comparing Zimmer, loc. cit., pp. 122, 124, who sets up, after Kuhn, the Yadavas, Anavas, Druhyavas, Turvaçās,

and Pūravas as the names of these five peoples. Now the fact is that the grouping of the plural names mentioned above occurs only in one passage in a late book, i. 108. 8, for the other passage cited by Zimmer contains only four names, and these are not peoples, but persons in the singular (viii. 10. 5), whereas the designation 'five peoples' occurs frequently in the older books, with nothing to indicate who they were. But when Zimmer says that these five were opposed to Sudās, and goes on to describe those that fought under Sudās against the five, he is only sharing in the common misinterpretation of the hymn recounting the battle. Without any authority for such a division except what is contained in the hymn itself, current criticism divides the battle-forces into two great groups : one of the five peoples with a hero or two besides, and one of the Pakthas, Bhalānas, Alinas, Viṣānins, Çivas, and others. How forced and awkward is the translation based on this assumption may be seen in Ludwig. There is not a shadow of reason for it in the text. On the contrary, a simple ingenuous translation gives the perfectly plain result that all the other peoples mentioned in the hymn are opposed to Sudās and his Tṛtsus. But we must recall the situation. The priest Vasiṣṭha is triumphing in this hymn, not only over his master Sudās' foes, but also over the priest of those foes, his rival, Viçvāmītra. The tone of the hymn is exultation mingled with scoff at Viçvāmītra, whose name 'all-friend' is played upon, as was that of Turvaça (above) ; while other less palpable plays on words are strewn through the song, making havoc of the witless translations of those that cannot see the point of Vasiṣṭha's jokes.

Another remark before proceeding to interpret this hymn. The battle is called always 'that of the ten kings.' Where are the ten? By confusing plural and singular we shall not find them. It is strange that, with the distinction so pointedly made in the text, our translators keep on rendering 'the Druhyus' for either Druhyu or Druhyavas. The first is 'the Druhyu,' i. e. the king of the Druhyavas, and so throughout. Now if we regard this we shall find that we have just ten kings mentioned, either by title or by name. These all are the ten kings of the Battle of the Ten Kings. They collected, besides their own, a number of unimportant tribes, as is expressly stated of our hero : he led and others followed and formed a confederation. Some of these peoples are spoken of in the plural without kings worthy of mention, probably because they were underlings of the Ten—save that, antithetic to Druhyu, we find his people the Druhyavas, and to Anava the Anavas, especially mentioned. The tribes of the other kings are not mentioned, but their part is designated by their leader. Of course I do not mean that the Druhyu is a name, but it is a title, 'the Druhyu' par excellence standing for the king of the Druhyavas, and to be kept apart from the plural Druhyavas = *druhyūr jānah*.

A detailed criticism of preceding translations of the hymn I must waive, except in so far as the following version in support of what I have said above is itself a criticism.

The Battle of the Ten Kings, Çimyu, Turvaça, the Druhyu, Kavaça, the Pūru, the Ānava, Bheda, Çambara, Vaikarna I., Vaikarna II., who led against Sudās, the king of the Trtsavas, supported only by his own tribe, and by Indra with his priest Vasiṣṭha, their own and the following tribes (who were either not believers in Indra or trusted to the prayers of the priest Viçvā-mitra), viz. the Matsyas, Pakthas, Bhalānas, Alinas, Viṣānins, Çivas, Ajas, Çigravas, and Yaksavas (vii. 18. 5 ff.).

(Translation :) 5. The floods that had extended themselves he that is worthy to be praised in song made shallow, easy to cross for Sudās; but Çimyu the vaunter, and them that hated him, Indra made to be the flotsam* of rivers.

6. First to go as leader (as sacrifice) was Turvaça the Yaksu; † the Matsya people, too, as if *dead set* on riches, followed, the Bhr̥gu-people [or priests] and the Druhyu-people. The Friend crossed (his) friend from one side to the other. ‡

7. The Paktha-people (and) the Bhalāna-people chimed in, the Alina-people, the Viṣānin-people, (and) the Çiva-people; § and he who (as) 'Friend of the Aryans' (mis)led (them)—herds of cattle (for booty) to the Trtsu-people—(he also) came in battle against (us) heroes. ||

* A pun on *çāpa* 'drift' and *cāpa* 'the oath' of the confederated kings? Compare *çapāṭha*, x. 87. 15, and see Mbhā. vii. 17. 18.

† Turvaça was the *puroḍās*, 'cake of sacrifice,' a pun on *purogās* 'the leader.' Below the scornful imagery is continued with *paçū* 'the beast of sacrifice,' and here intensified by substituting *yāksu* for *yādu*, the ordinary tribe-title of Turvaça, which not only makes him ridiculous, as if he belonged to the unimportant Yaksu tribe, but also, by the involuntary connection of this word with *yaj*, suggests the sacrificial idea prominent in *puroḍās*, as if *yāksyah* = *yaṣṭavyah*, not as Sāyana takes it in viii. 60. 3, but (as *yaṣṭavya* itself may mean) = 'the one to be sacrificed.' Those that would read *yāduh* here lose both points of the double sarcasm; and that the hymn is full of punning and disdainful innuendo he that runs may notice.

‡ The Matsya people are *mad* for wealth; *niçitāh* (compare in vs. 11 *niçīçātī*) can be given only by rather vulgar English, meaning both eager and destroyed, hence the *iva*. In *sākhā* we have the first of five or six allusions to the name of Viçvā-mitra (see below). The word *atarat* has two senses, 'overcame' and 'got over.' It is possible that in *viṣūcoḥ*, which means 'in two ways,' as well as its obvious application would indicate 'on both sides' (of the river, of course), we also have an indication of the pun in the verb. Compare iii. 31. 8.

§ There is no indication here that a shift from Turvaça's side (that of the Ten Confederates) to that of the Trtsu is intended. *ā bhananta* means 'shouted toward' ('zujauchzen,' PW.) with the sense of my translation.

|| The obvious force of *ā* is to repeat *ā bhananta* (as e. g. in 19. 11, *ūpa*) which would make two sentences. As it is possible, however, that *ā* goes with *ājaṇan*, this cannot be insisted upon. In *ānayāt* used with accusative of offering and dative of person to whom the offering is brought we have the same construction as in i. 121. 5 and iii. 7. 6; the irony is again plain. The priest Viçvā-mitra has in fact sacrificed his friends to the Trtsus by advising battle. He is present: cf. vii. 33. 6. Viçvā-mitra, 'friend of all,' is here ridiculed as *sadhāmā-āryasya* 'friend of the Aryan people' (cf. 5. 6); for Vasiṣṭha regards himself (in the fam-

8. Evil-minded, misdirecting the unquenchable (river), fools, they have torn apart (the river) Paruṣṇī. In greatness he encompassed, lording it over the earth—(till like) a beast (of sacrifice) the (sapient) priest lay frightened.*

With this exultant mockery of his rival's discomfiture the poet turns to the account of the panic and retreat to the river.

9. They went, as if to a goal, to destruction, to (the river) Paruṣṇī. Not even the swift one came home. To Sudās Indra overgave in flight the enemy (those that had no Friend), (bestowing) upon the manly one those of unmanly voice.†

10. They went, crowding as they could around the 'Friend,' like cattle from the meadow without a herdsman—pretty cattle, prettily cast to earth—horse and foot they followed one another.‡

11. Indra (was) the hero who as king for glory's sake strewed down the one and twenty tribes of the two sons of Vikarṇa, (and)

ily phraseology : compare vii. 76. 4, *tā id devānām sadhamāda āsan*) as a *sadhamād* of Indra (and *satyā tṛtsūnām abhavat purōhitiḥ*, 83. 4), while Viçvāmītra is only ironically the 'Aryans' friend' (Indra's title). The Bhr̥guṣ may be priests, but in connection with the others they are here more probably a clan of fighters, as is perhaps implied in ix. 101. 13, *āpa çvānam arādhāsam hatā makhām nā bhr̥gavaḥ*. Read *gāvya* (cf. vs. 10) for *gavyā* (though not necessarily, as we may translate 'who as friend of the Aryans with lust for booty led his friends,' as in vs. 14). *Ajagan* : without preposition *gam* takes accusative in the sense 'go for, attack.' Compare *gāchā 'mītrān*, vi. 75. 16, of a weapon. With *nṛ̥n* compare 19. 9-10, *sākhā . . nṛ̥nām*, i. e. 'of us.'

* With 'evil-minded' the description continues. The antithesis to the priest by whose advice the river was 'torn apart,' and who is therefore said to 'lord it over earth,' is found in vs. 16, where Indra is the real 'lord.' The evident pun in *cāyamāna* 'wise' and 'frightened' needs no commentary, but I cannot render it into English. The antithesis is very dramatic—'he encompassed earth lording it'—'he lay frightened like a beast of sacrifice.' The subject is of course the same. Latent is somewhat the same thought in *açayat* (*pr̥thivyām*) as that which is expressed by Æschylus with *ἐξουσι δ' ἡν λάβωσιν ἐν ταφῇ χθονός*; only here the dishonored lying is simply contrasted with the proud encompassing. There may be a sinister meaning in *ādītim*, as applicable to those that died in it.

† Compare *mṛdhrāvāc* in 13. *Ārtha* and *nyarthā* (goal and destruction), another simple pun. The following clause shows that the *ārtha* was the goal of safety sought in the retreat across the river, which, however, drowned the invaders. 'Not even' the swift, as in vii. 86. 6, *svāpnaç canēd*; but in each case the negative force is doubtful, and the reference may be to Turvaça as the 'swift' one—the swift one alone came home.' *Amītrān*, a pun as in *durmītrā*, vs. 15, depending on accent, descriptive or possessive, evidently for the third time alluding to Viçvāmītra. *Abhipitvā*, perhaps the same as *ārtha*.

‡ 'Around the Friend' (*abhi mītrām*), for the fourth time alluding scornfully to Viçvāmītra. The very clear pun in *pr̥çni* has not escaped the translators—literally 'pretty (variegated) cattle (they were) and on the pretty (earth) cast down.' The translation is therefore a little free, keeping rather the tone than the exact sense. 'Horse and foot,' 'yoked (horses) and (foot) fighters.' The word *gāvaḥ* 'cattle' resumes the scorn in *gāvya* (*gavyā*) of vs. 7. With the 'meadow' image compare a different application, viii. 92. 12; i. 91. 13. 'Without a herdsman,' *āgopāḥ*; the true tender of flocks is Indra, *gopatīḥ*, vs. 4.

made of them an overthrow (an outpouring), even as a clever man chops down (at one stroke) the straw upon the ground (of sacrifice).*

12. And thou, the Thunderer, didst cast down into the water (king) Kavaśa, the renowned, the venerable, [after] the Anu, (and) the Druhyu (kings). Then thy followers who rejoiced in thee elected a (true) friendship for friendship.†

13. Indra swiftly broke apart their strongholds, with might (destroyed) their seven towns.‡ The booty of the Anu (king) thou hast given to the Trtsu (king). We conquered the Pūru (king), the false speaker in the assembly.§

14. The booty-seeking Anu-people and the Druhyu-people, sixty hundred, six thousand, sixty strong men and six, have fallen asleep (in death). All these heroic deeds were done of Indra [for his worshiper Sudās]|| as a reward.

15. By Indra directed, these [O ye] Trtsu-people ran down like waters let loose. The enemy [they that had a bad Friend], being well-nigh destroyed, have left all their good things for Sudās to enjoy.¶

16. The party of the strong (man), the (impious) drinker of cooked (milk), the one who rejected Indra, the vaunter, him Indra smote to earth, unmade the madness of the madness-maker, (truly) divided the paths, (truly) lording it over the course.**

* *Ni çīçāti . . sārgam akr̥ṇot*. The second image reflects rather the idea of *ny āstah*, yet so as to combine the fall in the first. Another allusion to sacrifice in *barhis*. Compare, 87. 1, *sārgo nā sṛstāh*; also, with this verse, 3. 4. In x. 43. 2 the image is inverted, *rājeva dasma*. Compare Viçvāmītra in iii. 33. 11-12.

† Construe as in 87. 3. A repetition of the allusion above in *sākhā* to Viçvāmītra. All Indra's true followers now turned from the *anindrā* side (16) and acknowledged him. Such was Turvaça. Notice Druhyū (king) distinguished from the plural people. Compare 19. 9, *asmān vṛṇīṣva yūjyāya*.

‡ Perhaps only conventional: compare i. 63. 7, 'thou didst destroy their seven towns when thou didst overthrow them like straw.' Also i. 174. 2, idem, with an allusion to 'false speakers,' as here in vs. 13. In the first passage Purukutsa and Pūru are punned upon with *pūrah* (towns). Compare with *mṛdhrāvāc* vii. 6. 3, *akratān . . mṛdhrāvācāḥ pañān . . ayajñān*.

§ Probably not in apposition, but from the common use of *vidātha* referring to Viçvāmītra. The singular again or the adjective for him who is *kar' ēçoxip* the Pūru, the king; the Anu (*ānavah*), the king of the 'Anu-people' (*ānavah*).

|| Suggested by Ludwig's translation. *Duvoyū = duvasyū; duvasyū, duvasy 'give,'* as in *sudās dā*, but form and cæsura oppose the ingenious idea.

¶ *Tr'tsavah* is almost certainly *trtsavah*, as the image, in view of the above comparison alone, must apply to the enemy. In *durmitrāsah* we have another pun depending only on the accent. This is the last of the five or six evident allusions to Viçvāmītra.

** Rhetorical antithesis to the false lord, the weak divider of courses and paths, in vs. 8. In *manyīm manyumō mimāya* a slight alliteration, as if intended for a pun. The title 'vaunter' recalls Çimyu, who is so called in vs. 5. Perhaps better 'even a lion.'

17. With but little (help) this one thing did (Indra)—he smote a lion as it were with a goat, rent spears with a needle; and gave all good things for Sudās to enjoy.*

18. All thy foes have bowed before thee. Thou didst find out the overturning even of vaunting Bheda—cast down thy sharp bolt upon him, O Indra, who sins against mortals that praise (thee).

19. The (river) Yamunā helped Indra, and the Ṛtsu-people (helped him). Then he utterly despoiled Bheda. The Aṇa-people, the Āgru-people, and the Yakṣu-people have offered him tribute—the heads of their horses!

20. O Indra, the kindness and the wealth coming from thee neither through days of old nor at present can be estimated—even Čambara, that godkin in his own esteem, thou didst cast down from greatness.

So ends the finest lyric of ancient India.† Throughout kings and peoples are kept separate. If, as is possible, the name Turvāga is a nickname from the swift escape (cf. *turā*) of the Yadu king, it explains why he is always so called, Turvaṇa the Yadu, while the other kings are given either their name, Kavaṇa, Bheda, etc., or title, Druhyū etc., alone. We only confuse matters when we confound plural and singular where the original makes a distinction.‡ As to Zimmer's statement that the Yadus suffered the same fate as their companions, and his insistence on the five peoples so conspicuous in this poem, to read the poem aright disposes of the claim. There is no grouping of the 'five peoples,' nor is it possible to get Turvaṇa and Yadaṇa out of 'Turvaṇa the Yakṣu,' the first of which cannot mean the Turvaṇa-people; while, if it did, the latter is not the Yadu. Nor if we change the reading have we then a Yadu people differentiated from a Turvaṇa people.§

* We ought probably (but not necessarily) to read *ēkaṇ* for *ēkam*. The allusions are obvious and really witty. Instead of *sinhā* the unusual word *sinhyām* (masc. acc.) is used as a pun on *ṣimyām*. The lion, *Ṣimyū*, Indra destroys with little help, the Ṛtsu (from *ṛd* 'pierce'), first represented by the horn of a goat (*pétva*), which though small pierces the huge lion; then more plainly by the needle, which also pierces the larger spears; and this, in turn, *srakti*, is radically a reminder of the *srāj* or band of confederated kings; the only doubt being whether *srakti* means exactly 'spears.' This explanation is the only one that gives any point to the comparison, and itself shows that *ṛtsu* is not understood as 'white' but as 'piercing, destroying': witness the meaningless translations of Grassmann and Ludwig.

† From such beginnings came the Epic, not directly indeed, as a concatenation of ballads, but with like historical lyrics as a base of supplies.

‡ I have just received Brunnhofer's too ingenious speculations in regard to the Turks and Hyrkansians in the Rig-Veda ("vom Aral bis zur Gangā"). He appears to have omitted the reference to the Shah of Persia (*parṇu*) in viii. 6. 46. But it is hard to take seriously the vagaries of this work and its predecessors. Almost anything can be proved by quoting proper names with chance likenesses in any other language, and most of the matter is over-estimated *dānastuti* material.

§ It is strange that Zimmer (loc. cit.) does not state that his argument for vii. 18 rests on a change of the received text. As for the analysis

The history in the poem is, as I conceive it, this : Viçvāmîtra was supplanted by Vasiṣṭha as priest of Sudās. He originated the confederation of the ten kings as a means of vengeance, careless whether some were Indra-worshippers or not. These kings, with their own and many other tribes of which they represented the kingship (as Vikarna had left twenty-one peoples or tribes under the sway of his two sons), unitedly attacked Sudās (who believed in Indra : that is, in Vasiṣṭha) and were defeated. The song of victory proclaims all Sudās' foes as those of Indra, because it included some unbelievers. Turvaça was a believer, but in Vasiṣṭha's view one with the wicked. He was however saved, and through this special grace of Indra became prominent as his favorite and worshiper (as shown in the eighth book), while the Druhyu king was drowned, and probably the Anu king, whose successor (of course with the same title) appears in viii. 4. 1 as a worshiper with Turvaça of Indra. There is nothing in vii. 18 to indicate that Turvaça was really a disbeliever in Indra, or the Anu king either, the direct imputation of godlessness apparently referring to Çimyu and Çambara, with perhaps Bheda added. The others were only associates of the ungodly.

In our passage (viii. 4. 8), the great deed of rescuing Turvaça is referred to, not as usual with the formula 'Indra helped Turvaça the Yadu (king) over the river,' but with the words : 'We will not grow weak in thy friendship ; great is the wonderful thing done of thee the bull (Indra) ; let us look at Turvaça the Yadu ; on the left flank the bull covers (him) ; the generous one is not angry with him—(O Indra,) milk and honey are mixed for thee ; come hither and drink (at Turvaça's sacrifice).'

This seems to me the best than can be made of a doubtful text.* Indra is generous in helping Turvaça again to weal. Compare i. 174. 9, *pārīyā turvāçam yādum svastī*. In vii. 27. 4 *dānā* is epithet of Indra. We can scarcely dissociate the verb of our text from that in iii. 32. 11 (*yād anyāyā sphigyaḥ kṣām āvasthāh*), 'when thou, Indra, didst cover earth on the left side (i. e. when the monsoon storm-clouds came from the south), heaven held not thy greatness.† From what was said at the outset, *asya* should naturally refer not to Indra but to Turvaça.‡

which gives as residuum on the Trtsu side the tribes Pakthas etc.—apart from the fact that the text does not indicate this in any way, if there were so many tribes aiding the Trtsus we should never have had the expressions 'the little help,' 'the Yamunā and Trtsu-people helped Indra,' 'the goat and lion,' 'the needle.'

* *Savyām ānu sphigyaṁ vāvase vr̥ṣā nā dānō asya roṣatī*.

† Not *vas* 'eat,' as Geldner proposes in K.Z. xxvii. 216.

‡ The translations known to me connect this part of the verse closely with the following, thus giving no explanation of the preceding, and in so doing offer the following pleasing variety of interpretations. PW. : "He hastens to the left side (where the sacrificer imagines himself to be) ; he is not angry with (or does not despise) our feast" (v. s. *ruṣ* and *vas*). Grassmann : "He is clothed (with a sword) on his left hip ; he does not scorn the feast" (see G.'s explanation). Ludwig : "The bull rests on his left hip ; his splitter does not rage." Geldner (seriously ?) : "The giant eats up the left side" (of the sacrificial animal) !

But the 'covering' on the left flank is perhaps to be taken here rather metaphorically, as if the god were Turvaṣa's ally, and occupied that post of protection and honor. Thus, on the third day of the great battle described in the Mahābhārata, the left side is occupied by the best knight of the Pāṇḍus, Arjuna; and on the sixteenth day, when Arjuna makes all the arrangements, he stations his bravest brother Bhīma on the left, and stands himself with the king in the middle (see description in vol. xiii. of this Journal, pp. 208, 216). Indra is now Turvaṣa's *goptar*, to use the Epic expression.*

VII. viii. 5. 19, *yó ha vām mádhuno dr'tir áhito rathacársane: tátah pibatam aṣvínā.—tēna no vājinīvasū páṇve tokāya gám gáve: váhatam pīvarīr īśah.* Ludwig objects to *rathacársana* as 'box of the car,' because it is absurd to invite the Aṣvins to drink from their own bag; and he regards the *dr'tih* as a bag of sweets placed 'on the way of the car,' a sort of improvised restaurant, construing *tēna* as 'for the sake of this.'

The objection will not hold good. The bag of sweets is expressly stated to be attached to the Aṣvins' car. Compare iv. 45. 1, *dr'tis turīyo mádhuno vírapāte . . . (3) dr'tim vahethe mádhumanātam aṣvínā.* The construction of *tēna* is one with that in vii. 69. 5, *yó ha syá vām rathirā . . ráthah . . tēna nah gám yór . . ny aṣvínā vahatam.* It may sound odd to invite the Aṣvins thus, but no modern etiquette can separate the two *dr'tis* mentioned above.

VIII. viii. 5. 33, *éhá vām prusitápsavo váyo vahantu parní-nah* etc. What does *prusitápsu* mean? PW. defines *ápsu* as 'without food' (*psu = psā*), and then, rather dogmatically, gives to *psu* the meaning of 'appearance' alone. I hold, on the contrary, that *psu* means only food, both in composition and in *psúr*, which is the independent form. In certain compounds, the best example for the definition of PW. being *arunápsu* applied to the dawn, *psu* appears to have the meaning assigned to it by the Lexicon. Yet even in this best example the comparison of *ghṛtápratīkām usásam ná devīm*, vii. 85. 1, shows that, however much better the Lexicon's translation may suit our esthetic taste, the epithet of 'food-faced' is one not unknown to the Vedic poets; nor do the other compounds *áhrutapsu*, *ṛtapsū* (the Aṣvins) require the meaning 'form, appearance' for *psu*. On the contrary, these compounds are applied to the gods that bring dew and rain, which are often enough interpreted and referred to as food. Moreover, *psā*, from which it is difficult to separate *psu*, means only 'food,' and *psáras* only 'feast.' That other epithet of the

* I am rather doubtful about the propriety of admitting Epic battle-terms into the Rig-Veda, but see no other way of explaining the 'left hip' ('wing' or 'side' in Epic language), especially as this is a very natural expression in warfare of any date. Apropos of the 'needle' mentioned above, this is the formal name of a 'battle-array' in the Mahābhārata, but is too technical a term to be used here for elucidation (loc. cit., pp. 205, 206, 211).

Açvins' car, *viçvâpsnya*, can scarcely be otherwise understood; the car is preëminently one of food (vii. 71. 4). Of the compounds of *psu* mistranslated by P.W. and Grassmann, *vṛ'sapsu*, applied to the Maruts and their chariot, means 'having strong (rain) food : ' compare *vr̥ṣabhānna*. *Pruṣitâpsu*, applied to the Açvins' steeds which bring nourishment, reminds us of x. 26. 3, (*Pūṣā*) *abhī psūrah prūṣayati*. The word *arunâpsu* gives a combination of 'bearing food' and 'the food is red.' Now *arunâ* applied to the dew is not strange, since the food is regarded as *ghṛtā* or as heavenly soma, and the latter has often the epithet *arunâ*—which again, applied not only to soma, but in generalized expression (*vâsu*, Grassmann), has, as is the case with so many light-color words, rather the meaning of 'brilliant' than that of a definite shade. We must choose between a meaning applicable everywhere and one that may apply in some cases and cannot in others (*â-psu* and the cognates *psūr*, *psā*, *psāras*). I maintain therefore that *psu* means 'food' alone.*

IX. viii. 5. 36, *yuvām mrgām jāgrvānsam svādatho vā vr̥ṣan-vasū : tā nah prīktam iṣā rayīm*. Ludwig's attempt to elucidate this passage by the substitution of *svāpathaḥ* for *svādathaḥ* fails to satisfy, for two reasons. First, antecedently, because to indulge in conjectural readings without having exhausted all possible means of obtaining a good sense from the *textus receptus* is the worst possible kind of exegesis for a text so carefully handed down; and secondly, because, according to the Vedic way of looking at things, the dawn, here symbolized by the Açvins, instead of putting the beasts to sleep, wakes them up, as it does the rest of the world. Compare iv. 51. 5, *prabodhīyantīr usasaḥ sasāntam dvīpāc cātuspāc carāthāya jīvām* 'ye dawns, awaking the sleeping, biped and quadruped, to go alive.' To seek an antithesis between sleeping and waking, such as is given in x. 164. 3, is not here admissible. Grassmann, on the other hand, translates (as does the minor P.W.) "you like (enjoy) the lively beast," and explains beast as soma.

Despite these authorities, I think that *svad* in no case in the Rig-Veda means 'like,' or 'taste,' but always (literally or metaphorically) 'sweeten, purify.' The sense of the solitary verb must be taken from that of the verb as half explained by the adjuncts that modify it. These adjuncts all point to 'sweeten' as the meaning of the simple root. The cases are not many, and are easily reviewed. In x. 110. 10 the sacrificial post and Agni are together invoked with the words: *vānāspātīḥ . . agnīḥ svādantu havyām mādhunā ghṛtēna*; also, ib. 2, *svadayā (yānām mādhvā)*. Here 'sweeten' is obviously the proper translation, as is shown by *mādhunā*. But, if so, then in x. 70. 10, where the same author of sweetness is invoked, the same sense must apply :

* See now the paper read at the same meeting by Dr. Jackson on *psu*. Add to the above *viçvâpsur yajñāḥ*, clearly explained as 'food-full' by the following *prāyāsvantaḥ* in x. 77. 4.

vānaspate . . svādāti devāḥ kṛnāvād dhavāṁsi. And this must also hold good for i. 188. 10, where the post and Agni are again invoked, the latter with the words *agnīr havyāni sīsvadat.* But we have gained another point by this collocation : Agni sweetens the oblation. Then in iii. 14. 7, *sārvam tū agne amṛta svadehā,* why need we assume a new meaning for *svad*? Plainly Agni is invoked to ‘sweeten,’ as before. And in iii. 54. 22, *svādasva havyā sām īso didīhi . . agne,* to translate ‘enjoy’ is to go outside in order to get what lies within ; we must render ‘make sweet for thy self the oblation.’ Agni is the agent that sweetens the mixture.* Hence in ii. 1. 14, *agne . . tvāyā mātāsah svadanta āsutim,* the meaning must again be ‘through thy agency men sweeten for themselves the soma,’ not ‘taste.’ And when the middle is used without object the reflexive sense gives the best meaning. Thus, ix. 74. 9, *svādasvindrāya pavamāna pītāye,* ‘O soma, be sweet to drink,’ literally ‘sweeten thyself.’ It will be observed that the application is almost always to soma as the object and to fire as the subject, extending also to the verbal noun, as when in v. 7. 6 Agni is called the *svādanah pītunām.* In the one case remaining, where the gods in general take Agni’s place (vii. 2. 2, *svādanti devā ubhāyāni havyā,* on account of *ubhāyāni*), there is no reason for supposing a change of sense. Quite metaphorical, on the other hand, is the use of the verb in ix. (104. 1 and) 105. 1, *śigum nā yajñāḥ pāri bhāsata* and *svadayanta gūrtībhiḥ.* Here the sense of ‘sweeten’ is explained by the equivalent in 104. 1, and is the same as in viii. 49. 5 compared with ib. 50. 5 (Vāl. 1 and 2). In these passages soma is sweetened by song or [song] by milk.†

But these practically exhaust all cases where ‘enjoy’ can be maintained at all as the meaning of *svad*. For in i. 119. 2 *svādāmi gharṁām* (for the Aṣvins) is admitted to mean ‘I sweeten the hot drink ;’ and in ix. 62. 5 *śubhrām āndhah . . svādanti gāvah pāyobhiḥ* is worth mentioning only because the milk-sweetened soma here mentioned is further described in vs. 6 by the use of *ācūśubhan*, which explains, if explanation be needed, the ‘sweeten’ above as equivalent to ‘make pure, agreeable.’ With this slight extension of meaning (quite different from ‘enjoy’) we have a sense that fits the use of the root not only in its present form but in the related *svād*, *sud*, *sūd*. “The yellow (soma) becomes sweet” is Ludwig’s correct translation of *svādate* in ix.

* Compare iii. 4. 2, (*agne*) *imām yajñām mādhumantaṁ kṛdhī* It is not therefore even necessary to modify ‘sweeten’ to ‘purify’ so far as Agni’s work is concerned. The use here is metaphorical. Agni sweetens, i. e. makes pleasant (by cooking), and so is even said to provide the food. Compare i. 46. 4, ‘the lover of the waters (Agni) fills the Aṣvins with oblations’ when their buffaloes have brought the car at dawn. Compare πέρων ‘mellow, pleasant.’

† Vāl. 2. 5, *yām te svādāvant svādanti gūrtāyah pāurē chandayase havām* ; ib. 1. 5, *svadhāvānt svadāyanti dhenāvah.* In the latter *stōmam* is the received object ; *sōmam*, Grassmann. PW. assumes a *svad* = ‘entice’ for ix. 105. 1 (viii. 5. 36 is now rendered ‘enjoy’).

68. 2 ; and in the tag to the preceding hymn the food which is 'purified and sweetened by Mātariṣvan' (*pūṭām svaditām*) is (ib. 67. 32) explained as 'milk, butter, honey, and water.' It is this simple extension of 'sweet' to 'pure' that to my mind explains all the ramifications of the root in its various forms, and does away with the necessity of assuming a *svad'*, while connecting *sūd* and *svad*. The only case that remains for consideration under *svad* itself is ii. 4. 7, *asvadayān nā bhū'ma*, where Agni neither 'tastes' the earth (Grassmann), nor 'spices' it (PW. and Ludwig), but sweetens, i. e. purifies it, a very proper expression. As for what remains, *agniṣvāttā*, like *svādate* above, means not 'enjoyed by Agni' but 'purified by Agni'; *sūd* has never the meaning of 'enjoy';* and lastly *sud* in viii. 17. 6, *svādūs te astu saṁsūde . . . sōmah*, means 'sweet for sweetening thy body.'

viii. 5. 36, in accordance with the facts stated above, means (*svādathah*) 'ye sweeten' or 'ye purify' or 'ye make right' the beast (*mṛgām*).

The subject is the Aṣvins. These gods, besides being associated with Dadhikrā, iii. 20. 1 etc., are particularly described as possessors of a wonder-beast, *mṛgā*, strongly resembling the classic Nandinī (compare iii. 58. 1 and the *sabardūghā* cow). The question, therefore, arises whether we are at liberty to separate this *mṛgā* from the one alluded to in our passage. In the verses immediately preceding especial weight is laid upon the steeds of the Aṣvins, which are described as 'hawks' (vss. 7, 33), and bear the epithet *pruṣitāpsavaḥ* (33, see the last paragraph); but are again 'swift-footed horses' (35); the car itself being one that 'goes with nourishment' (compare i. 180. 1, *vām pavāyah prusāyan mādhvah*).

In the quotation given above apropos of *rathacārṣaṇa*, the bag of sweets is reckoned as 'a fourth' on the Aṣvins' car. A fourth what? The text reads, iv. 45. 1-4, *prkṣāso asmin (rāthe) mīthunā ādhi trāyo dṛ'tis turiyo mādhuṇo vi rapṣate : ud vām prkṣāso mādhumanta irate rāthā ācāvāsah . . priyām mādhuṇe yuñjāthām rātham . . : haṁsāso yē vām mādhumanto asrīdho hīraṇyaparnā uhūva ūsarbūdhaḥ : udaprūto mandīno mandinispṛ'caḥ*. Here we have another of the mild puns with which the Rîg-Veda teems. It is impossible to separate these *prkṣāsaḥ* from the *saptā prkṣāsāḥ* of iii. 4. 7. The gods themselves are *prkṣāḥ* (x. 65. 4 : compare Pischel, *Ved. St.* i. 96). The meaning hovers between 'lively' and 'life, means of life' (*vividus, victus*). The passage may be rendered thus: 'upon that car are three pairs full-of-life; the fourth, a bag, is dripping sweets. Up start [at dawn's appearance] your cars and horses full-of-life, having sweets. Yoke for sweetness the dear car; your birds, which have sweetness, which

* All the secondary meanings attributed to *sūd* go back to the simple idea of 'sweeten,' whence 'purify, make agreeable, make right,' etc. The Epic use = 'kill' must, I think, be explained in the light of *agniṣvāttā* (something like 'send to glory' = 'kill' in English), which is first applied to the purified seers.

injure not, have golden wings, are carriers (?), wake at dawn, bathe in (dew) water, with rejoicing touching the joyous (drink).’ The *Açvins*’ car is a wonder-car (*purumâyāḥ*, i. 119. 1): compare v. 78. 3; vii. 69. 1), and is drawn, as above, by steeds which are horses or birds (flamingoes, hawks), while the whole is represented as a ship (i. 46. 3; 116. 3; 183. 1—a later view?). The three-fold character of every thing in and about the car (i. 34; 118. 2) may be explained by the three-fold morning light which it represents.* The car rises with or just before the dawn (iii. 39. 3; 58. 1). The water and nourishment is the dew, which like Indra’s rain is a heavenly equivalent of the drink below. The bag is a cloud, or whatever is supposed to hold the dew. So far no special *mṛgāḥ*. But the sustenance-holder is not only a bag as above, but also figured as a *rāsabhah* (ἔρση). The *Açvins* themselves are like buffaloes and flamingoes (v. 78. 1 ff.: compare viii. 35. 7 ff.); † and their beasts, besides being represented as horses, hawks, and flamingoes, are also portrayed as buffaloes (‘hump-beasts,’ i. 184. 3 etc.). The dew-animal (*rāsabhah*, of course with the fruitful play of sense translatable by ἔρση, ἄρσην) is, however, always singular, and distinct from the plural *kakuhāḥ*. Moreover, the *rāsabhah* is the one prominent animal (i. 34. 9), like the *dṛ’tiḥ*; and in fact the *dṛ’tiḥ* is the tamer image, if it be an image, of what is strongly personified in *rāsabhah*. As all the animals of this variegated pair interchange, we find without much astonishment that the special wonder-beast is not always the same creature; but the important point is that the *Açvins* have one special animal at each occurrence, whether he be for the time being ass, horse, or buffalo. Thus, in i. 116. 7 the *Açvins* fill the jars on earth with ‘liquor’ (*sūrā*, dew, as rain is *sómah*) by emptying it ‘out of the horse’s hoof’ (repeated 117. 6, with ‘sweets’ substituted for ‘liquor’). But, on the other hand, just as *prkśāḥ* are on the car, and yet this word is attribute of the steeds (above, iv. 45. 1), so the bag of sweets is also represented by the ‘hump-beast’ making sustenance for mortals. Thus, in v. 75. 4, after saying that the *vānīcī* is fastened (*āhitā*: compare the bag above, viii. 5. 19) to the car, the poet adds *utā vān kakuhó mṛgāḥ prkśāḥ kṛnoti vāpusāḥ* ‘your marvellous hump-beast makes nourishment.’ There is then a double play in *prkśāḥ* . . . *dṛ’tis turīyah* above, viz. on quick and quickening and on horse and food (there is possibly a pun intended in *turīyah*, *turī*, *turīpa*). Therefore the pairs are with careful looseness said to be *ādhi rāthe*, as if of food, while evidently identical with the steeds

* The three-fold light is white, red, and yellow. The red is the dawn which mounts the *Açvins*’ car, then ‘gleaming,’ without special color, *puruṣandṛā* (viii. 5. 32, the *Açvins* when first appearing; their car, vii. 72. 1). When dawn takes her place in the car it becomes red (i. 118. 5), but afterwards preëminently yellow (golden, iv. 45. 4; viii. 5. 35). The red which follows the white disappears in yellow at sunrise.

† They are themselves like a bag in viii. 87. 1 (*krivir ná sēka āgatam*), as is Indra (*vṛṣabhā*) in i. 30. 1. I fancy both *dṛ’tiḥ* and *krivīḥ* should be translated ‘cloud (bag).’

of the next verse (which rise, *udirate*, as birds). There can be no doubt whatever that the steeds of the Aṇvins are at times conceived as food itself. Compare viii. 85. 7, *yuñjāthām rāsabham*, with viii. 22. 9, *yuñjāthām pīvarīr iṣaḥ*; and this again with viii. 5. 20, *vāhatam pīvarīr iṣaḥ*; and recall 6. 19 (above), where the Aṇvins drink from their own bag.

Such is in my view the *mrgāḥ* of our passage, and *mrgām jā-grvānsam svādathah* is equivalent to 'you make the (dew-)animal sweet (for us) as he grows lively' (wakes at dawn: compare *usarbūdḥ* above, iv. 45. 4), with which agrees well the following: *tā naḥ prīktam iṣā rayīm*, i. e. 'as such (as gods who come in a golden car and sweeten food for us) mix with (this) sustenance wealth for us' (perhaps a conscious reference in *pre* to *prks*). The gods come for a feast, but the quotations above show sufficiently that they bring sweets (*mādhv* etc.) to the worshiper. These sweets are the counterpart of the earthly food (*sōmah* is *jāgrvīḥ* in ix. 107. 6 etc.), and doubtless, as the beast pours out *sūrā* (see above) to earth, so the earthly drink is intimately connected with the heavenly; and the ultimate thought in the poet's mind may be 'you sweeten the drink' both of dew and soma,* the Aṇvins taking the place usually ascribed to Agni.†

The delineation of the *mrgāḥ* as food and buffalo is no more confused than the whole imagery connected with the Aṇvins. Yet this in turn is legitimately heterogeneous. The car that is a ship, the steed that is horse, buffalo, hawk, ass, and bag, are perfectly clear when we remember that the different images are only portions of a kaleidoscope of fancies, several metaphors describing the indescribable rise of dawn. *Rātham ēko aṇvo vahati saptānāmā*, i. 164. 2.‡

* In iii. 58. 7, *tirōahnyam juṣāṇā sōmam pibatam . . sudānū* (the dewy Aṇvins are to drink 'the soma of yesterday'). Compare this with the drinking from their own supply (as above); and note further i. 47. 4, (*dēvinā*) *viṣvavedasā mādhvā yajñām mimikṣatam* 'O Aṇvins, mix the sacrifice with sweetness'; and i. 181. 6, *prā vām ṣarādvān vṣabho nā niṣṣāt pūrūr iṣaḥ caratī mādhva iṣṇān* etc. 'one like a bull (Ludwig, your bull like a cloud) sprinkles sweetness'; and iv. 43. 5, *mādhvā mādhvī mādhv vām prūṣāyan yāt sīm vām pr'kso bhurājanta pakvāḥ* (the Aṇvins' sweet food compared to the earthly cooked food).

† That *mrgā* = *agni* is, I think, impossible here. The descriptions of light-divinities naturally often coincide. Thus Agni is a winged horse (iv. 15. 6; v. 1. 4, 7), a lion (v. 15. 3), a steer (v. 1. 8; 28. 4); *usarbūdḥ* (iv. 7. 8); his tongue drops honey (i. 60. 3); his steeds are buttery (iv. 2. 3; cf. iii. 6. 6); and he is of course 'lively' (*raṇvāḥ*, iv. 7. 5 etc.). In i. 46. 8-9 (to the Aṇvins) the 'drops of heaven' (*divā indavaḥ*) are as precious as and take the place of earthly water (*vāsu sindhūnām padē*), and the song begins when the drops (of the morning dew) fall.

‡ The image in i. 182. 7, *parṇā mrgāsya patārōr ivārābha ud aṇvinā ūhathuḥ*, is, I think, incorrectly translated by Ludwig 'like boughs for a flying beast to seize.' *Parṇā* in x. 68. 10 is 'leaf,' not 'bough,' and here 'wing.' Translate [what 'tree,' i. e. no tree there was in the sea for drowning Y. to climb upon]: '(ye were) like the wings of a bird (for him) to seize on; up ye bore him, safe and sound: he was like a bird in rising up, and the Aṇvins were wings to him; or, what wings are 'for

X. viii. 6. 7-8. I have incidentally alluded in the paragraphs above to the subject of Vedic puns. Such examples as the constant play on *vr̥dh* in its literal and metaphorical sense ('magnify');* on *vr̥śan* (ii. 16. 5 and often) and related forms; *sahāśram* with *sāhaskṛtaḥ* (viii. 3. 4); *svar*, 'sound' and 'light' (ib. 13); *hārī* and *haryatā* (viii. 12. 25: compare iii. 44. 1 ff.); *asūrē sūrāyah* (viii. 10. 4, 'illustrious where there is no lustre'); *nāma manāmahe* (viii. 11. 5); *turvāceturvāne* (viii. 45. 27)—are near and common instances. That on *jātāvedās* (vi. 15. 13) is well known. Above we had cases in *pṛ'kṣ prkṣā*, and in the whole hymn of the Ten-kings' battle.

Of these puns some are little more than a natural antithesis of the radical and metaphorical meanings; some may be unconsciously perpetrated; but others are as seriously intended as those of Æschylus and the writers of Scripture.

In the present passage, without a due appreciation of the extent of punning indulged in by the Vedic bards, no reasonable interpretation is possible. The text reads, viii. 6. 7-8, *imā abhī prā nonumo vipām āgreṣu dhītāyah: agnēh ṣocīr nā didyūtaḥ. guhā satīr ūpa tmānā prā yāc chōcanta dhītāyah: kánvā r̥tāsya dhātayā.*

The whole intent of this hymn is to establish a likeness between the gleaming darts of Indra and the coruscating thought (wisdom or wit) of the poet. The poet in the brilliancy of his words is like Indra in the brilliancy of his weapons. This is intimated at once in the third verse, where *jāmī bruvata āyudham* means 'they declare his weapon their own.'† In the verses under consideration here Ludwig makes the verb a parenthesis; Grassmann takes *satīh* with *kánvāh*, makes the poet compare lightning to a gleam of fire, and takes *dhītāyah* as 'flames.' The poet is like Indra, like a sun (compare 10-11, 20). The comparison rests in the first place on *dhī*, which, as usual, is not 'prayer' (Grassmann's ordinary translation), nor yet 'wish,' but 'thought, wit.' *Dhītīh* and

a flying creature' (notice the objective position of the genitive). *Mṛgāḥ patāruḥ* (*meregha*) is any winged creature. There is no need of Grassmann's specially large bird. With the above compare in general iv. 45. 5, *svadhvarāso mādhumanto agnāya usrā jarante prāti vāstor acvinā*; and iv. 58. 6 (of the sacrificial streams), *etē arṣanty ūrmāyo ghṛtāsya mṛgā iva kṣīpaṇōr īsamānāḥ*; the latter shows the streams lively as beasts fleeing from the arrow.

* Compare *ar*, *ār* 'exalt, praise' in viii. 16. 6.

† Totally misunderstood by the translators. Grassmann renders: (Since the Kanyas with their praises made Indra the success of sacrifice) 'his bolt is called their brother' (i. e. Indra defends them). Ludwig: 'Their words become a confederated weapon.' The prose of this poetical expression is simply that the priests' speech is as brilliant (a weapon) as Indra's bolt. Compare viii. 12. 31, *sustutim . . jāmīm, padēva* etc. But compare especially x. 8. 7, *jāmī bruvāṇā āyudhāni veti* 'declaring his own the weapons.' The Greek ἀεὶ φά τῶνδε κηρύξας, Ant. 192, is somewhat similar in extending the idea of relationship to mean similarity, but the Vedic *jāmī* keeps the radical idea of origin. We might almost translate 'native (to themselves) they declare Indra's weapon.'

dîth are played upon. *Agra* is 'sharpness, acuteness, cleverness'; *didyât* is 'brilliancy' (of light or of wit); *vîp* is a 'stick' and a 'song' ('stave': compare *âyoagrâ vîp*, x. 99. 10); *dhârâ* is the 'stream' (of soma) and the 'sharp blade' of a sword or fire. The puns, however, are not confined to this place, for in verse 10 *medhâ* 'wisdom' and *medhâ* 'weapon' (?) are played upon (compare 45); in 21 *sutâh* is used in two senses; in 28–29 *gîr* and *gîrî*, *vîp* and *vîpânâ*, *saṁgathâ* (*saṁgamâ*, *gâthâ*), and *upahvarê* (the technical sense played upon) are further illustrations, and even with *hârî haryatâ* in 36, and *çaryandvati* (soma-place or a place) in 39, we have not exhausted the list. The later writers took the old inherited hymn and brightened it up a little more (vs. 43, 'this very old wit swelling with milk and honey the Kanvas have increased with praises'), by adding some established formulæ of puns, ere the *danastuti* with which it in its new form concludes is introduced. It is absurd to suppose that all this paronomasia is accidental. It is not even incidental. The poet exults in his cleverness: 'By birthright of old (or 'with old thoughts') I make shine the song in Kanva-fashion' (ib. vs. 11).

To indicate the connection and illustrate the comparison here urged I translate with these verses (7–8) the third, sixth, ninth, tenth, and eleventh: 'Since the Kanvas by their praises made Indra the success of sacrifice, they call his weapon their own . . he hewed off the head of the whirling demon with his strong hundred-knotted bolt. In the acuteness of our staves we sing out aloud these (sparkling) thoughts, which like the fire's gleam shine forth even (where) they have been concealed. Whenever our sparkling-thoughts gleam forth, may we the Kanvas by means of (this) sharpness of sacrifice* go forth to wealth in cattle and horse, (go) forth to strength first of all—for this cleverness (weapon?) of sacrifice even I have from my father inherited; (bright) as a sun was I born. With old thought (or *jânmanâ* 'by birthright') I make the songs shine in Kanva-fashion, in the same way as Indra puts fire upon himself.†

XI. viii. 7. 15–16, *etāvataç ca cid esâm sumnâm bhikseta mârtyaḥ: âdâbhyasya mânabhîh. yê drapsâ iva rôdasî dhâmanty ânu vṛṣṭîbhîh: âtsam duhânto âksitam*. Ludwig takes *âdâbhyasya* to refer to the course of the Maruts. But compare the collocation of i. 55. 7: *nâ tvâ kêtâ â dabhnvanti bhûrṇayaḥ . . âprakṣitam vâsu bibharsî* etc. So here the object of desire seems

* *Rtasya dhârâ* (compare viii. 86. 5, *rtasya çr'ṅgam*); *dhârâ* is 1. 'stream': compare S. on vs. 2, *rtasya vâhasâ = stotreṇa*, and 2. 'the sharp blade or flame' (of fire, viii. 73. 9). *Medhâ* 'wisdom,' *medhâ* 'weapon' (?).

† *Yênendrah çuṣmam id dadhê*: compare *çuṣman* 'fire,' and *çuṣmîn* 'fiery.' The meaning may be 'whereby'—i. e. it is the song that gives Indra his fiery strength. The first sentence of our passage ends with *ûpa tmânâ* 'and even, although.' The next clauses *prâ-prâ* are connected—'when forth shine the songs, forth may we go to wealth'—*prâ-naç*, 'go to, get to, attain.'

to be non-deceptive indestructible wealth. The genitive may be compared with that in vii. 90. 7, *ārvanto nā grāvaso bhikṣamānā indravāyū' sustutābhiḥ . . huvema* ; in vii. 83. 6, *havante . . indram vāsvaḥ* ; and in viii. 49. 9, *etāvatas ta imaha indra sumnāsyā gómataḥ* ('we desire thy so great and rich good-will'). The *āpraksitaṁ vāsu* of i. 55. 7 is the effect of the god's power. In ix. 78. 3 (*yācante sumnām pāvamānam ākṣitam*) it is the good-will of the god that is unlesened. In our passage, the wealth represented in 16 as *ākṣitam* is in 15 called *ādābhyam*. The verb governs both *sumnām* and *ādābhyasya* ; the former implying the gods themselves, and the phrase being equivalent to *bhikṣeta sumnayatūḥ (marūtaḥ) ādābhyasya vāsvaḥ. yad adābhyam asti tad asty aksitam, huveta (maruto) aksitasyotsasya, ity arthaḥ!* I do not understand the translation of Grassmann, who seems to construe *bhikṣeta* doubly. Ludwig renders : 'May the mortal in his songs beg for the good luck (*glück*) of this their so great irresistible march.' But can *sumnām* mean 'good-luck'? Or, if L.'s *glück* is subjective, 'happiness,' is it possible to avoid construing *eṣām*, standing in the regular genitive position of a personal pronoun indicating possession, with *sumnām*? Yet *sumnām* with a genitive invariably denotes the mental attitude of the person represented by that case. Compare i. 107. 1, *devānām sumnām* ; ii. 11. 16, *te sumnām* ; iii. 42. 6, *te sumnām imahe* ; iv. 30. 19, *nā tāt te sumnām* : see the list in Grassmann. But viii. 18. 1-2 alone would appear to be decisive on this point : *idān ha nūnām eṣām sumnām bhikṣeta mārtyaḥ : ādityānām . . anarvāno hy eṣām pānthā ādityānām*, where, as in our passage, the second verse explains the first, and 'safe paths' is the indication of the gods' good-will.

It is not quite certain what *drapsā iva* of our passage means. To say the rain-clouds are 'drop-ful' (*drapsīnaḥ* in i. 64. 2) is legitimate ; but to describe them as 'like drops' seems senseless. Ludwig ("die wie funken schnauben") regards the drops as sparks of fire. But this is an odd comparison. Besides, fire and sparks are properly the object, not the subject, of the verb *dham*. Compare *dhamitām agnīm* in ii. 24. 7.

I guess the phrase means in prose 'just as the soma-drops splash (or sprinkle, ferment), so the clouds splash about (besprinkle) the two worlds with rain.' Compare viii. 96. 13, *āvat tam (drapsām sōmasya) indrah cācyā dhāmantaṁ* ; and ix. 73. 1, *drapsāsya dhāmataḥ* (of soma). The tertium is merely the yeasty look of a splashing shower. I translate viii. 7. 15-16 : 'Let a mortal for (the sake of) some so great and certain (good) beseech with prayer the kindness of (such gods as) these, who about both worlds like (fermenting) drops (of soma) splash with rain, in that they pour out a stream unceasing.'

The same expression, 'unceasing, unlesened stream,' occurs again i. 64. 6 ; iii. 26. 9, and elsewhere ; the adjective is applied to wealth in *ākṣitāvasuḥ* (of Indra), viii. 49. 6.

XII. viii. 13. Improvisation. I have referred above to the

making of Vedic hymns. Far from being 'seen,' i. e. inspired (although this claim is made in the Rig-Veda), the hymns are often spoken of as manufactured. A third class remains, the hymns that are improvised—that is, like most improvised poetry, half original and half reminiscence of others. Undoubtedly these three classes (between the second and third of which no sharp line can be drawn) exist in our collection, and for that reason it seems to me that the truth here also lies between the two extremes of criticism; and that, although subjective interpretation can be our only guide, those critics err no less who would deny all save a ritualistic machine-poetry to the Rig-Veda than do they that would interpret its most mechanical hymns as the ingenuous outpouring of a naïve spirit. There are songs made to order; songs made for money; songs invented for the sacrifice, and as artificial as its ritual. But, on the other hand, there is much genuine joy, sorrow, and anger; much beauty of expression, much real poetry. And if the skilful interpretation of the last few years has brought the Rig-Veda nearer to earth than formerly, it has not degraded it by making it more human. In fact, the poetic value of the work is increased. The meaning of many hymns once wholly 'in the clouds' becomes real, the songs themselves gain in character. But of course there is much to eliminate that is neither prose nor poetry, but metrical commonplace, or the hocus-pocus of theological mystery.

The present hymn seems to me to be one of those which have been put together in a mechanical way, old material in new form, a sort of improvisation.

1. *dāksaḥ* is strength, explained by *māhātā hi śāh*: compare SV. *dāksa* for *śūsma* in viii. 15. 7.

6. Indicative of the composition of the whole hymn. Compare ix. 102. 5, *juśānta yāt* (also 29 below), and ii. 5. 4, *vayā ivā 'nu rohate* (also 17 below). Compare also with 13, below, viii. 1. 29; with 14, viii. 4. 12; with 18, viii. 92. 21; with 29, viii. 12. 32; with 30, viii. 3. 5; 7. 6 etc. Notice *yāthā vidē* twice, 14 and 49. The hymn is patched, the fragments chiefly of Kaṇva stock. Indicative of the half extemporaneous character seem to me to be verses 7, 19, 20.

7. *pratnavāj janayā girah*. Grassmann, 'rege an; Ludwig, 'gib anlass zu.' But compare i. 109. 2, *stōman janayāmi nāvyaṃ*; vii. 26. 1, *ukthān janaye nāvīyah*, where at least the claim is made that the song is newly begotten.

19. *dadhē (ukthāni)*; 20, *māno yātrā vī tād dadhūr vīcetasah*. Grassmann translates *dadhē* as 'consecrates,' Ludwig, as 'completes;' and the latter says that *mānah* cannot be *stōtram*, who yet in 15. 12 renders *manmaçāh* 'in different songs.' If *mānman* passes from thought to song, why not *mānah*? It is like *dhītūh* and *dhītām* (see above); *mānah* is the subjective side of *mānman*.* The expression *pāvakaḥ* in 19 must refer to the poet (so

* Compare ii. 3. 3, *īdīto mānasā = girā* (see *īd* in ii. 6. 6 etc.).

Ludwig), not to Indra (Grassmann): 'when the praiser, true to the rule, makes thee hymns aright, he is called pure, purifier, supernatural.' The 'supernatural' improvisatore is compared to Agni, whose epithets he here assumes (*śuciḥ, pāvakāḥ*, passim; *ādbhutah*, ii. 7. 6). In the next verse he is compared to Indra.

20. 'Truly, when the wise create such a hymn, it is reckoned the attribute of a Rudra (= Indra, 28), that impetuous song in ancient manner;' or we might with exactness translate 'the song which goes along on the old basis.' It is certainly improper to dissociate in sense *yahvām māno vidadhuh* of this verse and (*mānma*) *dadhātha yahvām* of iv. 5. 6 (compare with these i. 59. 4, *giro yahvīh*). The verb *cetati* is to be taken as in viii. 12. 1 = 'is esteemed, regarded.'

The sixth verse also expresses the extempore character of the hymn: 'when the active praiser flings aloft to thee his songs' (*āti praçardháyad gírah*); and such seems to be the intent of the eighth verse: * 'Like waters tumbling play the favors of him by means of this my wit (song)—of him who is called ruler of the sky.' Ludwig follows Grassmann in taking *ayā dhiyā* as 'in this song' (he is called, etc.), most assuredly wrong. It is dangerous to pay too much attention to the cæsura. The dancing or playing of Indra's favors (rather than the too special meaning 'generosity,' advocated by Oertel for *sunṛtā*, A. O. S. Proc. 1891, p. xc) is the result of praise. On comparing viii. 14. 10, *apām ūrmir mādānā iva stōma indrā jirāyate*, and ib. 16. 2, *yāsmīnn ukthāni rānyante viçvāni ca grāvasyā: apām āvo ná samudré*, there would seem to be the suggestion of a confused image here, as if the songs danced along in portraying the favors, and so the favors described 'dance down' (on the feet of the verse). The songs are explicitly described thus 'like a waterfall' (x. 68. 1, *giri-bhrājo nōrnāyo mādanto br'haspátim abhy ārkā anāvan*); yet here only the favors described by the song are expressly compared, and said to 'play like tumbling waters:' compare *pravat-vátibhir ūtibhih* in vs. 17. Hence 'by means of this song [I induce the god to be favorable, so that] his favors dance down to us like a waterfall' must be the final meaning.†

The general character of this hymn, the specific imitations, the expressed intent to create a hymn for the occasion, seem to me to indicate an impromptu origin. The remaking of old songs is not uncommonly alluded to, as perhaps in iii. 31. 19, *tām aúgirasván námasā saparyān nāvyañ kṛñomi sanyase purājām*; and in the parallels to *janayāmi* above. Another fragmentary hymn (made of *disjecta membra* from the hymns immediately preceding) is vii. 85. 5.‡

* *Kṛidantya asya sunṛtā āpo ná pravātā yatīh: ayā dhiyā yā ucyāte pātir divāh.*

† Indra, by the way, is himself a dancer, viii. 92. 3 (*nṛtuh*), as is Uṣas, x. 29. 2, *usāsah*. . . *nṛtāu*, a pun on *nṛtamah* in vs. 1; perhaps an implied pun in *kṛidanti sū-nṛtā* (*nṛt*) likewise.

‡ The expression *yāthā vidé* (14 and 29) is usually taken to be from *vid* 'find.' It seems to me that it must bear the sense of *ut videtur* and *ōc*

LEXICOGRAPHIC NOTES.

viii. 4. 1, *sīmā*. 'Although called elsewhere, yet thou art most called here.' *Sīmā* is adverb, related to *samāyā* (with the same stem as *similis*), as is ὅμως to ὁμῶς, i. e. 'all the same, nevertheless, yet.' The form *sīma* is also adverb, like ἄμα in form.

viii. 4. 3, *āpitvā, prapitvā*. *Ā-pitvā* (like προσήκων) 'relation to a person, friendship;' and (literally) 'getting in, going in (so *abhīpitvā*), ending.' *Prapitvā*, 'getting to, going for;' *apapitvā*, 'getting off.' The root may be *pī* 'go.'

viii. 6. 19, *enām*. The text reads: *imās ta indra pr'ṇayo ghrtān dūhata āciram: enām rtāsya pipyūsih*. Grassmann changes the text; Ludwig regards *enām* as an instrumental. In viii. 7. 13 the Maruts bring sweet drink from heaven. In i. 64. 5 the Maruts *dūhānty ū'dhar divyāni dhūtāyo bhū'mim pinvanti pāyasā pāriprayah*. The 'bellowing children of Pṛṇi,' who 'start up with the winds and milk out rich food' (*pipyūsim īsam*) in viii. 7. 3, are also the Maruts. Although in the last hymn (comparing ib. vss. 10 and 16) the *pr'ṇayah* may not always be the same, yet in view of ib. 7 there can be no objection to taking them here as Maruts. But, whether as of heaven or of earth, Indra's cattle may be fat with *amṛ'ta* = soma, heavenly milk. Read *enā 'mṛ'tasya* 'in that they overflow with the immortal drink.' For the position of *enā* compare x. 14. 2. As in vs. 43 of our hymn (*dhūyam mādhor ghrtāsya pipyūsim*), we may here translate in conjunction with the following (which shows the *pr'ṇayah* to be clouds; Indra is the *gārbha* which the Maruts surround as the holy order does the sun): 'These thy kine, O Indra, which like the supporting order round the sun encircling thee as mothers make thee an embryo, milk out butter and milk since they swell with immortal ghee.' It is, however, as Grassmann suggests, possible that *enā* may stand for *enāh* (*amṛ'tasya*). A further possibility is to read *enā* as adverb = 'here;' compare v. 19. 3, *enā mādhwā nā vājayūh*. 'Swelling with ghee' seems more appropriate than 'swelling with holiness' or sacrifice; and the genitive would seem to depend on *pipyūsih*.

viii. 7. 12, *prācetas*; viii. 13. 20, *vicetas*. Men may be *vicetasah* (vii. 7. 4), though the epithet is more naturally one used of divinities, 'very wise.' But *prācetas* is a Promethean epithet, used only of divine beings or things. The sole exceptions are first in the late hymn that concludes the sixth book, directed to the weapons (the epithet here is applied to horses, vi. 75. 13), and in viii. 27. 21, *vāmān dhatthā mánave . . jūhvānāya prācetaśe*, where the priest is thus honored. In x. 83. 5 Manyu is a personified wrath, and treated like a god. Illustrations of the divine use in i. 64. 8; viii. 8. 7 (*vatsupracetasā*). Ludwig's sneer at Grassmann on viii. 7. 12

δοκεῖ, 'as is recognized, seems best,' 'as is the rule.' The middle is not altogether lacking, and of course in a phrase might be preserved. It is difficult to see how the usual meaning can have developed itself from a radical idea of 'find.'

is, therefore, rather uncalled for. 'Wise in respect of the intoxicating draught' is epithet of the gods.

viii. 15. 10, *svapatyāni*. PW. maintains two *svapatyā*: 1. *a.* a good work; *b.* adj., doing a good work; 2. *a.* adj., possessing good descendants; *b.* good descendants: *ā* fem. (RV. i. 54. 11). Grassmann omits 1. *b.*, but otherwise agrees with PW. that *svapatyā* must be derived both from *āpatya* 'descendant' and from (*apatya*, equivalent to *āpas*) *ap* 'work,' of which the proper adjective and noun are *apasyā*, *apasyā*, *svapasya*. Ludwig, on the other hand, erratically maintains as a general thing that our word is either adjective or abstract to *svāpatih*, translating by 'free,' 'independence, self-lordship,' and the like. For 'good works' and 'self-lordship' the Vedic terms are *sukṛtāni* and *svarājyam*. Whether we have a synonym of either in *svapatyā* remains to be seen. As between PW. and Ludwig, the rareness of *svāpatih* and the regular resolution of *su-apatyā* would incline the judgment to accept rather the derivation of the former than that of the latter. One very grave objection, however, makes against the etymology (*su*)*āpatya* = (*su*)*āpas*—namely, that there is no such word as *āpatya* = *āpas*. Since, on the other hand, *āpatya* = 'children' is a common Vedic word, it cannot be assumed as antecedently probable that *svapatyā*, meaning, as is admitted, 'with good children' or 'good children' in many passages, should not have the same meaning in all, unless this signification be found impossible on other grounds. Such passages as would seem to support the meaning 'works' must therefore be severally examined with special reference to the inadmissibility of this signification. They are few and easily reviewed. The derivation of the simple *āpatya* meaning 'children' is patent. Like the later *adhitya* and *upatya*, it is an adjective formation which may be employed as a substantive, and is derived (without the necessity of a verb expressed) from *āpa*, comparable therefore with *editus*, *ἀπόγονοι*, *ἐκγονα*, 'offspring.' This simple noun is used in both early and late literature, always in this sense; and, furthermore, of the sixteen cases of *su-apatyā*, ten certainly contain this idea; three may do so (doubtful or negative in value for interpretation); and only three are of such nature as to seem to make it necessary to resort to *apatya* 'work,' a word unknown. I say certainly of the ten, therein following both PW. and Grassmann, and rejecting summarily Ludwig's 'free,' as the meaning of an adjective in almost every instance describing the word 'wealth'; since, apart from the fact that *sva* is not resolved, and *su-apatyā* always is resolved, 'free wealth' is unparalleled, while 'wealth of children' is a common Vedic phrase. Ludwig himself is inconsistent; for he renders *svapatyām āyuh* in i. 116. 19 as 'life with children.'

The following ten passages, then, contain *su-apatyā* in the sense of *āpatya* 'children':

To Indra, i. 54. 11, *rāyē ca nah svapatyā iṣe dhāh*.

To the Aṅvins, i. 116. 19, *rayīm suksatrām svapatyām āyuh
svīryam nāsatyā vāhantā*.

- To Agni, ii. 2. 12, *rāyāh . . . prajāvataḥ svapatyāśya śagdhī naḥ.*
 To Agni, ii. 4. 8, *kṣumāntaṁ vājāṁ svapatyāṁ rayīṁ dāḥ.*
 To Agni, ii. 9. 5, *krdhī pātīm svapatyāśya rāyāḥ.*
 To Agni, iii. 3. 7, *āgne jārasva svapatyā āyuni ūrjā pinvasva*
sām iso didīhi naḥ.
 To Agni, iii. 16. 1, (*agnīḥ*) *rāyā īce svapatyāśya gómata īce*
vṛtrahāthānām.
 To Agni, iv. 2. 11, *rāyē ca naḥ svapatyāśya deva dītiṁ ca*
*rāsvādītiṁ urusya.**
 To Agni, vii. 1. 12, *yām aṣvī nītyam upayāti yajñām*
prajāvantaṁ svapatyāṁ ksāyāṁ naḥ :
svājanmanā śeśasā vāvṛdhānām.
 To Agni, ib. 5, *dā no agne dhīyā rayīṁ svītram*
svapatyāṁ sahasya praçastām.
 To the Waters, x. 30. 12, *āpaḥ . . . rāyāç ca sthū svapatyāśya*
pātñīḥ.

The three negative cases are :

- To Indra, i. 83. 6, *barhīr vā yāt svapatyāśya vṛjyāte,*
 (Indra rejoices) 'where the sacrificial straw is
 strewn for *su-apatyā :*' PW., 'for good works ;'
 Grassmann, 'to get children ;' Ludwig, 'for an
 independent life.'
 To Agni, iii. 19. 3, *sā téjyasā mānasā tvōta utā çikṣa*
svapatyāśya çikṣóḥ : PW. 'doing good works ;'
 Grassmann, 'wealth of children ;' Ludwig,
 'help-bestowing freedom' (compare *svapat-*
yāśya śagdhī naḥ above).
 To Indra, viii. 15. 10, *tvām vṛśā jānānām mānhiṣtha indra*
yajñise : satrā víçvā svapatyāni dadhiṣe :
 PW., Grassmann, and Ludwig (see the
 Commentary) as above.

Since the question whether in iii. 19. 3 the word be adjective or noun is not material to this examination, I pass now to the three cases where PW. and Grassmann unite in translating 'works.' In the cases thus far considered there is no intrinsic value of such sort to be seen—which, however, it is permissible to assume in the last three if the following three cases prove the necessity of recognizing it :

- To Agni, i. 72. 9, *ā yé víçvā svapatyāni tasthūḥ*
kṛvāntō amṛtatvāya gātūm.

This verse somewhat resembles in form x. 13. 1, *çrvāntu víçve amṛtasya putrá ā yé dhāmāni divyāni tasthūḥ* 'let the sons of immortality hear, who have attained to the divine laws.' But as in the two following examples *su-apatyāni* is governed by the verb *kṛ*, it might be a question whether a more artificial construction were not possible here also, especially as *gātū* is found con-

* Pun on *diti* and *āditi*.

strued with a dative, and *âtasthus* with 'path' (ii. 24. 7, *â tasthuh kavāyo mahās pathāh*); whether we should not translate 'accomplishing all good works[?], they attained to the path to immortality.' This is decisively ruled out, however, by iii. 31. 9, where the second half of the verse appears again independently: *nī gavyatā mānasā sedur arkañh krñvāñso amṛtatvāya gātām*. The meaning is then 'creating for themselves a path to immortality, they attained to all *svapatyāni*.'*

It might be thought that the word *viçva* speaks for the interpretation 'works.' One verse shows that *viçva* may be taken just as well with 'children'—or 'offspring,' as the plural may perhaps better be rendered; for, as in Greek, a collective sense is often given by a plural adjective (noun). In this verse we find too a verb very prettily corresponding to *â sthā*, viz. *âchā gam* 'go to, attain to.' In an address to the Ādityas it is said of their worshiper, i. 41. 6, *sā mārtyah . . viçvañ tokām . . âchā gachati* 'he attains to full posterity,' 'to a great number of children' (Grassmann). Since it is entirely in accordance with Vedic ideas as well as with those of later times that the possessing of children is a means of immortality, there seems to be no reason why this passage should sever the meaning of the noun in question from that admitted above; and hence the *onus probandi* lies with the one who should claim that *su-apatyāni* cannot here denote 'offspring'—'who have attained (or do attain) to many children, (thereby) making for themselves a path to immortality' seems to be an uncontrovertible interpretation of i. 72. 9.

The second case is found in iv. 34. 9, *yé víbhvo nárah svapatyāni cākruh*. Ludwig here translates interrogatively "children," opposing Grassmann's "schöne Werke." That Ludwig is correct is shown by an examination of the situation. The special function of the Ṛbhus, to whom the hymn is addressed, is for mortal interest the manufacture of children. Compare i. 111. 2, *â nah . . taksata . . suprajāvatim isam: yāthā ksāyāma sārva-vīrayā viçā tán nah çārdhāya dhāsathā sv indriyām* 'make for us the food (strength) that is accompanied with offspring.' Here *suprajā* answers to *su-apatyā*, and 'offspring-full strength' is exactly the same as when Savitar is prayed to in iv. 53. 7, *dādhatu nah savitā suprajām isam . . prajāvantam rayim asmē sām invatu* ("gute kinder," Ludwig). That the Ṛbhus create children is shown by the common legends related of them. For, as in Greece and among the Hebrews, the fact that a person supposed to be past the time for having children is unexpectedly provided with them is regarded as the special grace of a deity. This the Hindu represented by saying that the deity made them young again, and such must be the interpretation of the rejuvenation

* Compare the use of *â-sthā* with *drōṇam*, *yōnim*, *rōdasī*, *vidāthāni*, *vātān*, *amṛtāni*, *bhūvanāni*, etc.; any object of attainment may in short stand in the accusative after *â-sthā*, though it is perhaps most commonly used with *rātham*, 'ascend the car.'

ascribed to the R̥bhū. Compare iv. 33. 3, *pūnar yé* (Vāja, Vibhvan, R̥bhū) *cakrúḥ pítarā yúvānā* 'ye rejuvenated the parents.*

The virility given by the R̥bhū, which is the same as the children-making of our text, is emphatically claimed as their boon in iv. 36. 8-9, *dyumāntān vājān vr̥ṣaḥśusmān uttamām ā no rayīm r̥bhavas takṣatā vāyah* : *ihā prajām ihā rayīm rārāṇā ihā grāvo vīrdvat takṣatā nah*.†

This appeal to the R̥bhū to give offspring is like that in i. 111. 2, where *suprajāt* = *su-apatyām*. Now, when in iv. 34. 9-10 the good works of the R̥bhū are given in detail, if we take *svapatyāni* to mean 'children,' we get the proper complement of the list. Otherwise all reference to this important function is omitted, and in the midst of detailed works we get a general 'good works'—'the heroes who make children' seems, therefore, to be here the proper meaning (the Vedic perfect, as often, a strong present).

The last example is in vii. 91. 3, *té vāyāve sámanaso ví tasthur vícṣvén narah svapatyāni cakrúḥ*; complemented by 4, *yāvat t́aras tanvō yāvad ójo yāvan náraḥ cákṣasā dīdhyānāḥ*. We have here the worshippers of another child-bringing god, Vāyu. This half-verse describes what happens to his faithful followers : 'Like-minded with Vāyu, they extend themselves, and make many children as long as they live' (literally 'as long as their bodily vigor lasts and they see with their eyes').‡ So it is stated in vii. 90. 2 : '(O Vāyu,) thou makest this (thy worshiper) distinguished among mortals, and one strong son after another is born to him' (*jātó-jāto jāyate vājy āsya*). The translators entirely miss the point of the second verse in our passage, which simply completes the sense of the first. Ludwig thinks that *ví tasthuḥ* means that the priests stand around in different places during a sacrifice (!) ; but he conservatively adds that the sense is very doubtful. It means just what it does in i. 72. 9, where the sense of *ā yé vícṣvā svapatyāni tasthuḥ* (etc., see above) is completed by *maṁnā mahādbhiḥ prthivī vī tasthe mātā putráir āditir dhāyase vēḥ* 'mother earth, the endless one, extends herself

* Compare also i. 20. 3 ; 161. 3 ; iv. 35. 5 ; 36. 3 etc. ; also iii. 60. 4, where, as in the quotation above, the details of the work of these deities is given. Most of the R̥bhū hymns are in the fourth and first book. The one in the seventh (vii. 48) shows them more as comrades of Indra, i. e. as *cávaso nāpātaḥ* (i. 161. 14) 'children of strength,' than as *mānor nāpātaḥ* (iii. 60. 3) 'children of Manu' (wisdom). Their excellent works (*sukṛtāni*, iii. 60. 4) are fashioning one vessel into four, making the Aḥvins' car, rejuvenating parents (I do not think it is stated that it was their own parents), manufacturing arms, skinning a cow (iii. 60. 2), etc. and supplying mortals with children, as said above.

† Compare i. 117. 24, *aḥvinā rārāṇā putráṁ . . adhattam* ; vii. 36. 9, *utā prajāyāi gr̥naté vāyo dhuh* ; x. 183. 1, *prajām . . rārāṇaḥ (agnīḥ)*.

‡ Contrast iv. 33. 9, *abhi krátvā mánasā dīdhyānāḥ* ; 50. 1, *pratnāsa r̥ṣayo dīdhyānāḥ*, with the *cákṣasā dīdhyānāḥ* = βλεποντες, 'living,' of our passage.

in greatness through her mighty sons for the nurture of the bird.' In 8, Saramā finds out where the bird Agni is (hitherto concealed), by whom the people of earth is nourished (Agni is the god called on as the creator of beings [vii. 5. 7], and as favorable to *āpatya* 'children'). Then earth with her mighty children extends herself with sons (for they 'attain to full posterity') mightily, and (by sacrifice etc.) 'nourishes the bird' (Agni : cf. iv. 5. 8, Grassmann). In the same sense also is *sāmanaso* (*vāyāve*) to be taken, as explanatory of 'extend themselves,' for Vāyu extends himself everywhere.

As this exhausts the list of cases where *su-apatyāni* can with any show of reason be supposed to come from *apatya* = *āpas* 'work,' it seems to me reasonable to discard this meaning of *apatya*, and recognize only one *apatya* = 'offspring,' and one *su-apatyā* = '(with) good offspring.' Sense and syntax justify the antecedent probability that this is the case. Only one doubt can remain—that in respect of the verb. Since in the cases of unsuspected meaning *dhā* is the usual verb, it may be questioned whether *kr* in these two last instances can take its place. The roots are practically synonymous, however, and the objection amounts only to saying that because *su-apatyāni* is governed by *dhā* in some cases it must be governed thus in all—which is an unreasonable claim. Besides, although *apatya* offers no elucidation on this point, being construed in this connection only with *duh* once and metaphorically (ix. 10. 8, *kavér āpatyam ā duhe*),* yet the analogy of other similar words shows that there is no impropriety in taking *svapatyāni cakrāh* as 'made good offspring.' The act of procreating is *putrakrthā*, v. 61. 3; the verb is used with *rētas* 'seed' (vii. 33. 7, *trāyas kṛvanti bhūvanesu rētah*, viz. sun, water, wind : compare the three united gods in v. 41. 4); with *jātāni* 'creatures' (vii. 82. 5, *yād imāni cakrāthur viṣvā jātāni*); with *tānā* 'posterity' (ix. 62. 2, *tānā kṛvānto ārvate*); and with *putrān* 'sons' (i. 162. 22, *no vājī . . putrān . . kṛnotu*).†

The application of the above to viii. 15. 10 (third of the negative instances above) is as follows: Indra is a god especially called upon to give children (compare the first quotation in the

* Else *vāhamānā āpatyam*, i. 174. 6; *āpatyam ichāmānaḥ*, i. 179. 6; *yēbhīr āpatyam mānuṣaḥ parīyase*, viii. 49. 8.

† In x. 85. 45, *imām tvām indra mīdhvāḥ suputrām subhagām kṛnu . . putrān dāhehi*; viii. 4. 6, *putrām prāvargām kṛnute*; vii. 101. 1, *sā vat-sām kṛvān gārbham ōsadhīnām* (cf. viii. 6. 20), the construction is predicative. In ix. 109. 9, *induh punāndh prajāṁ urānāḥ karad viṣvāni drāvīnāni naḥ*, I am inclined to think that *prajāṁ* is governed by *urānāḥ* in the sense given by Bollensen, Z.D.M.G. xli. 504, 'shine, give:' compare *dīdhi* (ii. 2. 6 etc.), used in the same way. In regard to the collocation of *prajā* and *iṣ* (in ix. 8. 9, *prajā* is children, not as Grassmann takes it) compare the differentiation in i. 179. 6, *prajāṁ āpatyam bālam ichāmānaḥ* etc. The word *dhā*, as in the first list of quotations, is sometimes exchanged for *dā*, as in x. 85, 41, *putrāṇc cādād agnīḥ*; v. 25. 5, *agnīḥ putrāṁ dadāti dācūṣe*.

last note);* he is the virile power among the people, *vr'ṣā jānā-nām* of our verse. As such he is here invoked with the words *satrā vicvā svapatyāni dadhiṣe*. The ordinary verb is here used, but in the middle voice. This is, however, no real objection. In vii. 80. 2, (*usās*) *nāvyam āyur dādhanā*, and in i. 26. 8, *dadhīre (vāryam devāso naḥ)*,† we find undoubted cases of the middle used actively, not to speak of other probable instances.

This paper was presented at the meeting, April 22d. Two weeks afterwards, and when the greater part of the paper was in the printer's hands, I received the second volume of the *Vedische Studien*, in which some of the minor points here considered are treated (*sāyām* as 'evening,' *sīmā*, *prapitvā*). I regret that I was unable to incorporate the results of this previous criticism into the present essay.

* Compare also viii. 6. 23, *ā na indra mahīm iṣam pūraṁ nā darṣi gomatīm : utā prajāṁ suvīryam* ; x. 157. 2, *yajñāṁ ca nas tanvāṁ ca prajāṁ cādityāir indraḥ sahā ciklpati* ('Indra shall fashion us children').

† The latter of the two cases is enough to prove this point. The former is "undoubted" so far as the translators' version would indicate ; but possibly the middle sense is here reflexive, 'the dawn renewing her own life.' In two cases I am sure that the translators fail to give the right sense in denying active force to *dadhiṣe*. The first is x. 54. 5, *vicvā dadhiṣe . . vāsūni . . tvām indrāsi dātā* (Grassmann, "du hast"), like ix. 64. 1, *dhārmāṇi dadhiṣe* (Gr. "empfangst gebühr") 'givest laws.' The use is the same as in v. 38. 2, *yād . . iṣam . . dadhiṣe* (Grassmann and Ludwig, "takest"). The god is here praised, not for what he gets but for what he gives, as is evident from 1: 'great is thy giving, give power to us;' (then 2) 'when thou givest strength, it becomes celebrated.' Quite doubtful is iii. 18. 5, though Grassmann here rendered actively.